

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成29年度
(第21号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2017

Volume XXI

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2018・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2018

Sex-change in Buddhist Legal Literature with a focus on the Theravāda tradition

Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ

Abstract

Sex-change is a widespread phenomenon in Buddhist literature, most probably inspired by Indian narrative literature where it appears already earlier. The ultimate cause of sex-change in Buddhism is *karma* (Pāli *kamma*), and its first mention in the Theravāda tradition is in the monastic law code (*Vinaya*), followed by the *Milindapañha*, and the Pāli commentaries (*atthakathā*, ca. from the 4th c. CE onwards). The present contribution examines the references for sex-change in the Theravāda legal literature (I). As a kind of preview, select references to sex-change in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition are collected and compared (II). The bulk of the information on sex-change comes from a long passage in the *Vinaya* commentary, the *Samantapāśadikā*. This passage is given in the original Pāli and an English translation as an Appendix (III) to this contribution.

Keywords

Sex-change, female and male sexual characteristics, *liṅga*, *liṅgaparivattana*, Theravāda, Mūlasarvāstivāda

Introduction

Sex-change is a widespread phenomenon in Indian literature from Vedic times onwards, and it is mentioned in texts of various religious movements (Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism). It appears mostly as a male to female, rarer, as a female to male transformation¹ caused either by divine intervention (gods, apsarases) as a curse or a boon, by magical means (herbs or pills), by bathing in a magical pond, by changing one's sex with that of another person, by changing sex at will, on account of actions (*karma*) or as an act of truth (Skt *satya-kriyā*, Pali *sacca-kiriya*).² Sex-change thereby consists in the change of the biological sex and gender,³ and is reversible.

Sex-change as represented in Buddhist texts certainly was inspired by its presence in the Indian cultural setting in which Buddhism originated. But it had to be adjusted to the Buddhist doctrine concerning its potential cause. Therefore, sex-change in the Buddhist context is finally caused by the agent of causality, namely by *karma* (Pāli *kamma*). In the

¹. Rare are transformations into a sexless being (*napumsaka*), Doniger O'Flaherty 1980: 308; Gonda 1989: 70.

². On sex-change see Anālayo 2014: 111–114 (with further literature in n. 8); Anderson 2017; Appleton 2010: 95; Balkwill 2016: 127–148; Balkwill forthcoming; Brown 1927; Cabezón 2017: 277ff.; Dhammadinnā 2015; Dhammadinnā 2015–16; Dhammadinnā 2018; Doniger 1999: 260ff.; Doniger O'Flaherty 1980: 299ff.; Esposito 2013; Finnegan 2009: 133–140; Gethin (in preparation); Goldman 1993; Gyatso 2003: 102f., 110f.; Ohnuma 2000: 124ff.; Paul 1985: 166ff.; Perera 1993: 161ff.; Schuster 1981: 24–69; Young 2004: 191–210.

³. Anderson 2016: 232; a more detailed discussion is found in Gethin (in preparation).

Theravāda tradition this seems to remain the only cause.⁴ In other schools⁵ such as, for instance, that of the Mūlasarvāstivāda, sex-change could be deliberately caused by a person for whatever purpose (see below, II 6). But probably in these cases too a karmic reason stands behind it. Nevertheless, this needs further investigation. In Mahāyāna texts the deliberate change of sex is effected by female Bodhisattvas, who have reached a high spiritual level by their magic abilities.

In the present contribution I will look at sex-change in the texts of the Theravāda tradition, trying to examine the regulations and their position more closely. Each layer of texts puts before us aspects of sex-change not dealt with in the previous layers. Such new aspects appear for the last time in the third *Vinaya* subcommentary, the *Vimativinodanītikā* (12th/13th c. CE). The younger sub- and sub-sub-commentaries to *Vinaya* and *Vinaya* condensations (*Khuddasikkhā*, *Vinayavinicchaya*, *Pālimuttaka*) either comment on this topic very briefly or reuse information contained in the *Samantapāsādikā*, the *Vinaya* commentary that contains the most details about sex-change. In addition to the analyses of the information given in various legal texts, therefore, the relevant section from the *Samantapāsādikā* has been added in an Appendix to the present article in Pāli and English translation.⁶

As the Theravāda and the Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions form two different ends of a monastic legal development, I assemble information on sex-change from the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition as far as it is dealt with in secondary literature in a sort of preview at the end of my article.

Sex-change in the Theravāda tradition has been taken up already by P. V. Bapat who in 1957 gave a concise, but comprehensive sketch of the relevant regulations in the Theravāda tradition, summarizing and paraphrasing the findings in the commentary and subcommentaries, and referring to sex-change in other Buddhist traditions and in Indian narrative literature. The last two and a half pages of his short paper are devoted to the question whether “all these stories about the change of sex” are “merely fanciful, or” whether they “have any basis which can be explained” (Bapat 1957: 213). Bapat mentions several medical cases.⁷ More recently sex-change was dealt with from a modern perspective by Scherer (2006: 65–76), who looks among others at the passages from the *Theravāda-vinaya* as providing “an empowering opportunity for a Modern Buddhist inclusive anthropology and spiritual ‘metagenderism’” (Scherer: 2006: 65); and by Anderson (2017) who considered the

4. At least in the Abhidhamma and legal literature. See also in a wider frame Young 2004: 203ff.

5. Dharmaguptakas, Sarvāstivādins, Mūlasarvāstivādins, Mahīśāsakas and Mahāsāṃghikas. For their *Vinayas* see Clarke 2015. Since these schools were located in different areas of India and beyond, their law codes were exposed to a variety of culturally different influences. In addition, they were redactionally closed at varying times. It is to be assumed that all the *Vinayas* contain regulations regarding sex-change. But to date no general investigation of this topic has been carried out.

6. Part of this passage has been translated in Anderson (2017), and the complete section in Anderson 2016: 237–240. Her translation is flawed by a missing knowledge of the legal terminology and the commentarial style, and is partly unintelligible. Anderson (2016: 241), with respect to the English translation of the parallel in the Chinese counterpart of the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha*, states “the Chinese translation of this passage is clearer than the Pāli above, but no less detailed.” This characterization does not do justice to the Pāli text which is clearer and more detailed, at least, than the English translation of the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha*, but, unfortunately, not in Anderson’s translation. Therefore, it doesn’t seem superfluous to attach text and translation to the present contribution.

7. Finnegan 2009: 134, n. 235, notes that in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* such cases seem not to be understood as hypothetical, and that in the modern tradition at least one case of spontaneous sex-change from man to woman has been reported to her.

respective passages from the *Vinayapiṭaka* and the related commentary, i.e. the *Samantapāśādikā*, in search for “the implication” ... “for contemporary understandings of sex-change, transgender, and sexuality as a whole in today’s cultures”.

I. Sex-change in the Theravāda tradition

1. The background

As stated above, narrations of sex-change were present in the Indian cultural environment before Buddhism originated. Therefore, it is conspicuous that no references to sex-change are found in the canonical scriptures of the Theravāda except for four passages in the monastic law code (*Vinayapiṭaka*), where they are in the youngest layers (see below, I 3.1). Thus it seems that sex-change came into play in the Theravāda tradition only at a relatively late date, when the discourses, and large parts of the monastic law code, had taken shape already. That the first traces are in the monastic law code, is certainly not fortuitous. If such sex transformations are understood as possible outcomes in a culture, it cannot be excluded that they also happen to occur within the Buddhist monastic community, and if so, the legal experts had to know such a case’s legal implications and how to handle it, even if only theoretically.

The Buddhist community of monastics is separated into two legal entities, the male and female communities, that is the monks’ (*bhikkhusaṅgha*) and the nuns’ community (*bhikkhunīsaṅgha*). Ordinations (*upasampadā*) as a monk (*bhikkhu*) or a nun (*bhikkhunī*) are separate legal procedures which differ from each other in several points:

- obstacles to an ordination are partly different for male and female persons;⁸
- ordination as a nun requires the pre-ordination stage as a *sikkhamānā* for two years (Pāc 63 N);
- whereas a male person is ordained at age twenty at the earliest, married women (*gihigatā*)⁹ may be ordained at age twelve already (Pāc 65–67 N);
- whereas a male person is ordained by a community of monks only, female candidates are ordained by a community of nuns first, and subsequently by a community of monks, or, in case of the Mūlasarvāstivāda, by an ordination procedure in which a community of monks and a community of nuns are involved;¹⁰
- whereas a monk can leave the order, and later be reordained, a nun must not formally leave the order, and, if she leaves the order informally, must not ever be reordained.¹¹

Given these differences with respect to ordination it is obvious that legal experts had to know whether or not a monk or a nun who underwent sex-change remained a monastic, that is, a nun or a monk. This is answered in the affirmative, and implies that both ordinations are of

⁸. This holds true for all Buddhist schools.

⁹. Kieffer-Pülz 2005: 225ff.; von Hinüber 2008: 11ff., assumes that the word *gihigatā* defined as “*purisantaragatā* ‘one who has gone to another man’ designates a non-virgin, a woman that has had intercourse with a man”, and comprises married women, widows, but also courtesans. He further understands the twelve years as the time the *gihigatā* spent already as married women, widows, etc., limiting this understanding, however, to the earliest layer of the *Vinaya*, that is the *Pātimokkha* rules and the old commentary (Hinüber 2008: 13), and conceding that in the layer of the introductory stories the twelve years have been understood as the age of the candidate already (Hinüber 2008: 14).

¹⁰. This refers to the historically developed final forms of ordination, and does not say anything about the special forms of ordination that occurred earlier among monks as well as nuns, such as, for instance, the ordination of Mahā Kassapa or the Sākiya women. See, for instance, Kieffer-Pülz 2010: 218, n. 4.

¹¹. For the Theravāda see Kieffer-Pülz 2015–16 with a brief overview on other schools; for an opposing view concerning the Theravāda see Pañdita 2017; for the Dharmaguptaka Heirman 2016–17.

equal rank, despite the differences in their procedures. It thus is important to see whether any peculiarities are connected with such a change.

2. How does sex-change function

Sex-change is described in only a single passage of the Theravāda canon. There it is simply stated that the sexual characteristic¹² of the other sex manifested itself in a monk or a nun while asleep. Waking up the monastic realized the change of his/her bodily shape. The former monk now had a female body, the former nun that of a male (Vin III 35,₁₂₋₂₄, see below, I 3.1). Thus a spontaneous transformation into the other sex occurred during sleep without any visible reason behind it. The context given does not contain any clue either.

In the commentarial layer of the Theravāda scriptures the process of sex-change is described. According to the *Atthasālinī*, the commentary to the *Dhammasaṅganī*, an Abhidhamma text, in the case of the beings of the first aeons the male or female faculty (*indriya*) developed during their lifetime. Later it arose at the moment of rebirth dependent on the *kamma* accumulated in previous lives (As 322,₁₇₋₂₀). Only one such *indriya* exists at a time in a person,¹³ as is clear from the canonical *Yamaka*, again an Abhidhamma work.¹⁴ But this *indriya* can change within one and the same lifetime as is proved by the two *Vinaya* passages dealt with here (below, I 3.1). The *indriya* effects the development of the sexual characteristics (*liṅga*) of a person; a female faculty (*itthindriya*) leads to a female sexual characteristic (*itthiliṅga*), a male faculty (*purisindriya*) to a male sexual characteristic (*purisaliṅga*).¹⁵ In the case of a transformation from male to female thus the male faculty (*purisindriya*) disappears, and as a consequence the male form (*purisasanthāna*) or sexual characteristic (*linga*) vanishes, then the female faculty (*itthindriya*) arises and effects the female form (*itthisanthāna*). The same principle vice versa applies in the case of a female to male transformation.¹⁶ This is also described in some detail in the oldest of the *Vinaya* sub-commentaries, the *Vajirabuddhiṭīkā* (ca. 10th c. CE),¹⁷ and in the second *Vinaya*

^{12.} *itthiliṅgam*, is here translated as “female sexual characteristic”. *Liṅga* includes the entire bodily appearance of a person, if we follow the *Atthasālinī*, the commentary to the *Dhammasaṅganī*. As 321,₅₋₈: *tattha “liṅgam” ti sañṭhānam. itthiyā hi hatthapāda-gīvā-urādīnam sañṭhānam na purisassa viya hoti. itthīnañ hi heṭṭhimakāyo visado hoti, uparimakāyo avisado. hatthapādā khuddakā, mukham khuddakam.* “In this case ‘liṅgam’ means shape. For the shape of a woman’s hands, feet, neck, and chest, etc., is not like that of a man’s; a woman’s lower body is prominent, her upper body not so; a woman’s hands and feet are small, her face is small.” Based on the translation by Gethin (in preparation). The commentary proceeds with explanations of further differences in marks, work, etc., for the female as well as the male sex (also translated by Gethin).

^{13.} Even hermaphrodites (*ubhatovyañjanaka*) have only one faculty. The way sex-changes in the hermaphrodites is described in detail in As 322,_{30ff}, As (transl.) 491.

^{14.} Yam B^e III 117: *yassa itthindriyāñ uppajjati tassa purisindriyāñ uppajjatī ti? no. yassa vā pana purisindriyāñ uppajjati tassa itthindriyāñ uppajjatī ti? no.* “For whom there arises a female faculty, does for him arise the male faculty?” ‘No.’ ‘But, alternatively, for whom there arises the male faculty, does for him arise the female faculty? No.’”

^{15.} See the detailed description in As 321,_{3ff}. As (transl.) 488ff.

^{16.} For a more comprehensive description, see Gethin (in preparation).

^{17.} Vjb 112,₂₇-113,₇: *itthiliṅgam pātubhūtan ti* (Vin III 35,₁₂) *itthisaṅṭhānam pātubhūtam, tañ ca kho purisindriyassa antaradhānena itthindriyassa pātubhāvena. evam purisindriyapātubhāve pi. etena yathā brahmānam purisindriyāñ n’uppajjati, kevalam purisasanṭhānam eva uppajjati, yathā ca kassaci pañdakassa viñāpi purisindriyena purisasanṭhānam uppajjati, na tathā tesan ti dassitam hoti. tam pana itthindriyāñ, purisindriyāñ vā antaradhāyantam marantānam viya paṭilomakkamena sattarasamacittakkhaṇato paṭṭhāya antaradhāyati. paccuppanne indriye niruddhe itaram visabhāgindriyāñ pātubhavati. yasmā mahāniddam okkantass’ eva kir’ assa visabhāgindriyāñ pātubhavati, tasmā rattibhāge niddam okkantassā ti* (Sp I 273,_{23f}) *vuttam.* “The female sexual characteristic became manifest, means: the female form became manifest; and

subcommentary, the *Sāratthadīpanī* (12th c. CE).¹⁸ As the *Vajirabuddhiṭīkā* (ca. 10th c. CE) states, sex-change takes place in deep sleep (*mahānidda*) only (see n. 17). No other commentary makes any statement in this respect, and as we will see (below, II 6), this is different in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition.

Like the Brahmins the Buddhists, at least those from the 4th/5th c. CE onwards,¹⁹ considered the male sex superior, the female inferior. This explains why transformation from female to male was considered desirable, whereas the female to male transformation was less desirable.²⁰ The disappearance of each of the two sexes is thought to be caused by non-virtuous (*akusala*) *kamma* and the manifestation by virtuous (*kusala*) *kamma*. According to *Samantapāsādikā* and *Atthasālinī*, the following are the relations (Sp I 274,20–24 = As 322,25–29; see below, III Appendix § 8). The lines put in italics and underlined are not contained in the original text.²¹

this due to the manifestation of the female faculty because of the disappearance of the male faculty. So also in the case of the manifestation of the male faculty. As for the Brahma [gods], the male faculty does not arise, only the male form arises, and as for any ‘eunuch’ (*pañdaka*) the male form arises even without a male faculty; not is it like that for them (i.e. men and women). [That] is shown by this [statement]. But the female faculty or male faculty when it disappears, disappears from the seventeenth thought moment onwards in reverse order as for those who die. When the present faculty has vanished, the other different faculty manifests itself. Because, as is well known, the different faculty manifests itself in him only for one who has entered upon deep sleep, therefore it is said [in the *Samantapāsādikā*] in the night when he has entered upon sleep.”

¹⁸ Sp-ṭ II 101,_{6–18}: *purisasanṭhānam* *antarahitam* *itthisanṭhānam* *uppannam* *ti* (Sp I 273,_{24f}) *phalassa* *vināsuppādadassanena* *kāraṇassapi* *vināsuppādā* *vuttā* *ti* *daṭṭhabbaṇi*. *purisindriye* *hi* *naṭhe* *purisasanṭhānam* *antaradhbāyati*, *itthindriye* *samuppanne* *itthisanṭhānam* *pātubhavati*. *tathā* *hi* “*yassa* *itthindriyam* *uppajjati* *tassa* *purisindriyam* *uppajjati*” *ti* ‘no’; ‘*yassa* *vā* *pana* *purisindriyam* *uppajjati* *tassa* *itthindriyam* *uppajjati*’ *ti* ‘no’” *ti* *Yamakapakarane* *vuttattā* *indriyadvayassa* *ekasmīm* *santāne* *sahapavattiyā* *asambhavato*. *yasmīm* *khaṇe* *itthindriyam* *pātubhavati*, *tato* *pubbe* *sattarasamacittato* *paṭṭhāya* *purisindriyam* *n’* *uppajjati*. *tato* *pubbe* *uppannesu* *ca* *purisindriyesu* *sahajarūpehi* *saddhim* *kamena* *niruddhesu* *tasmim* *santāne* *itthindriyam* *uppajjati*. *tato* *purisasanṭhānākārena* *pavattesu* *kammajarūpesu* *sesarūpesu* *ca* *kañci* *kālam* *pavattivā* *niruddhesu* *itthisanṭhānākārena* *ca* *catujarūpasantatiyā* *pavattāya* *purisasanṭhānam* *antarahitam*, *itthisanṭhānam* *pātubhūtā* *ti* *vuccati*. *itthiyā* *purisalingapātubhāve* *pi* *ayam* *eva* *nayo* *veditabbo*. “**The male form disappeared, the female form arose**, means: it should be shown that by seeing the destruction or formation of a fruit, the destruction or formation also of [its] cause is stated. For when the male faculty is destroyed the male form disappears; when the female faculty arises, the female form is becoming manifest. For thus [it is explained:] because there is no coexistence of two faculties in one [consciousness] stream, on account of the fact that it is said in the *Yamaka* treatise: «[if someone asks] ‘For whom there arises a female faculty, does for him arise the male faculty?’ ‘No.’ ‘But, alternatively, for whom there arises the male faculty, does for him arise the female faculty? No.’» Previous to the moment, in which the female faculty (*itthindriya*) becomes manifest, from the seventeenth mind [moment] onwards the male faculty (*purisindriya*) does not arise. And previous to that (i.e. to the not arising), when the arisen male faculties are destroyed by lust together with the co-nascent forms, there arises the female faculty (*itthindriya*) in the [consciousness] stream. Then when the *kamma*-nascent forms, manifesting [themselves] through the appearance of the male form (*purisasanṭhāna*), and the remaining forms are destroyed, having been changed at some time, and the male form disappears, when the continuity of forms nascent from four [causes] manifests itself through the appearance of the female form (*itthisanṭhāna*), [then] it is said that the female form has become manifest. Exactly this method is to be known also with respect to the manifestation of the male sexual characteristic in a woman.”

¹⁹ The canonical and para-canonical texts do not contain a judgmental statement. The first reference of this type stems from the *Samantapāsādikā* and – probably quoted from it, since it is marked by *iti* [As 322,29] – from the *Atthasālinī*. In the *Samantapāsādikā*, this paragraph begins with the characterization of this section as one independent from the canonical text (*pālimutto okkantikavinicchayo*, Sp I 274,18, see below, III. Appendix § 8), that is, from the *Vinaya*.

²⁰ According to Appleton 2010: 97, the early sources see rebirth as a woman “as bad because of the suffering inherent in a woman’s life, rather than because of the idea that women are less capable of spiritual development.”

²¹ This passage is also translated and dealt with by Gethin (in preparation). A slightly different version is

sex-change	means for sex-change
male sex is established	by strong virtuous <i>kamma</i> (<i>balava-kusalakamma</i>)
male sex disappears	by strong non-virtuous <i>kamma</i> (<i>balava-akusalakamma</i>)
<i>male becomes female</i>	? by [relatively] ²² weak virtuous <i>kamma</i>
female sex is established	by [relatively] weak virtuous <i>kamma</i> (<i>dubbala-kusalakamma</i>)
female sex disappears	by [relatively] weak non-virtuous <i>kamma</i> (<i>dubbala-akusalakamma</i>)
<i>female becomes male</i>	? strong virtuous <i>kamma</i>

Following this explanation sex-change can only occur if the original sex disappears as a consequence of the destruction of the respective male or female faculty on account of non-virtuous *kamma*. Hence sex-change always is linked to some spiritual failure. But what makes the individual then develop the opposite sex? For a male person who has lost his male sex by strong non-virtuous *kamma*, weak virtuous *kamma* would be needed for the transformation into a female if we follow the explanation of *Atthasālinī* and *Samantapāsādikā*. Otherwise why shouldn't he develop into a sexless person (*napuṁsaka*) or an “eunuch” (*pañdaka*)²³?

In the case of a female the disappearance of the female sex is caused by weak non-virtuous *kamma*. If we follow the explanation of *Samantapāsādikā* and *Atthasālinī* we would expect strong virtuous *kamma* to be needed to transform her into a man. But this is not elaborated in these two texts or elsewhere in the Pāli scriptures.

In his commentary to the *Aggaññasutta* in the *Dīghanikāya* Buddhaghosa states that one normally is born with the same sex in the next existence, but that men change sex and become women because of sexual misconduct²⁴ – a statement confirmed by *Vinaya* and *Abhidhamma* commentaries²⁵ – whereas women can change into male if they “continuously increase the things which cause malehood” (*anupubbena purisattapaccaye dhamme pūretvā*).²⁶ What exactly these *dhammas* are, is not stated. Dhammapāla in his subcommen-

found in the Chinese version of the *Samantapāsādikā*: “Out of these two sexes, the male sex is superior, the female sex is inferior. Why? A man who has committed many offences loses his male sex and gets instead the female sex. A woman who does many good deeds is changed into a person of male sex.” (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 211).

²². In the light of the fact that birth as a human, whether male or female, already requires strong virtuous *kamma*.

²³. Concerning the *pañdaka*, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: III [Z 292] with n. 31; Cabezón 2017: 407ff.; 430f.

²⁴. In the *Dhammapadatthakathā* in the context of the story of Soreyya, it is stated that men who are adulterers fall into hell for hundreds of thousands of years after death, and when reborn as humans are then reborn as women (Dhp-a III 327,4ff.). Though this story would have been a good occasion to speak of sex-change in one life here, this is not done.

²⁵. Sp I 274,₁₈₋₂₄ = As 322,₂₄₋₂₉.

²⁶. This is the explanation for the development of the other sex from the commentary to the *Aggaññasutta* in the *Dīghanikāya* (Sv III 869,₁₅₋₂₁): *itthiyā cā ti* (DN III 88,₂₄) *yā pubbe manussakāle itthī, tassa itthiliṅgam pātubhavati, pubbe purisassa purisalingam. mātugāmo nāma hi purisattabhāvam labhanto anupubbena purisattapaccaye dhamme pūretvā labhati. puriso itthattabhāvam labhanto kāmamicchācāram nissāya labhati. tadā pana pakatiyā mātugāmassa itthiliṅgam, purisassa purisalingam pātūr ahosi.* “**And in the female**, means: For that one who in a previous time as a human being [has been] a female, the female sexual characteristic becomes manifest, [for] the male, [who] in a previous [time as a human being has been] a male, the male sexual characteristic [becomes manifest]. For, a woman (*mātugāmo*) obtaining the status of malehood, obtains [it] having successively increased the things (*dhammas*) that are the condition of malehood. A male obtaining the

tary to the *Dīghanikāya* mentions three elements: first, to ponder about the disadvantages of womanhood such as not being even one's own master, always being dependent on someone else, being a menstruating woman, bearing children, etc.; second, to ponder things which are impossible in the life as a woman, such as to reach the lustre of a wheel-advancer (*cakkavatti*), of Sakka, Māra, and Brahma, and to reach the enlightenment of a Pacceka-buddha, or a Sammāsambuddha; thirdly, to ponder all the things which can be achieved in a man's life.²⁷ In a nutshell we could say for a woman it is the carrying out of actions that produce merit with the aspiration to not become a woman again, but to become a man.²⁸

A concrete example of sex-change is handed down in the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, namely the story of the married layman Soreyya who at the sight of the golden complexion of the Elder Mahākaccāyana develops the wish that either the Elder Mahākaccāyana become his wife or that his wife's complexion would become like that of the Elder. At the very moment of having thought this (*cintitamatte yeva*) he loses his male sexual characteristic (*purisa-liṅga*), and the female sexual characteristic manifests itself (Dhp III 325,₂₁–26,₂). After another marriage in which he, now she, gave birth to two children, the male-turned-female reverts to her original sex by apologizing for her thought, and becomes Soreyya again.²⁹ Unlike in the theoretical explanations where adultery is mentioned as an example of strong non-virtuous *kamma* that leads to the loss of the male sex, here obviously the mere longing for the Elder Kaccāyana or the wish that his wife had such a complexion as this Elder has, was sufficient as a non-virtuous *kamma* to lead to the transformation from male to female. The reversion to Soreyya's original sex is linked to the exhaustion of the non-virtuous *kamma* which caused the sex-change, namely Soreyya's excuse vis-à-vis Kaccāyana, and the latter's acceptance of it. This implies that several sex-changes can take place in a single lifetime as seen in the case of Soreyya. In none of the texts of the Theravāda tradition is there evidence that only a restricted number of sex-changes are permissible for monastics. This is different in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition as we will see below (II 3).

status of femalehood, obtains [it] based on sexual misconduct. But then usually the female sexual characteristic becomes manifest for a female, the male sexual characteristic for a male.”

Young (2004: 203) quotes from the *Sadgatikārikā*, a “man who does not restrain his thoughts and unites with the wives of others, or who finds delight in illicit parts of the body, will be reborn as a woman”, and a “woman who is of good morals and little passion, who abhors her femaleness and constantly aspires to masculinity will be reborn as a man.”

²⁷. Sv-pt III 58,₉₋₂₃: *purisattapaccaye ti* (Sv III 869,17) “attano pi anissaratā, sabbakālam parāyattavuttitā, rajassalatā (B° add *vañcatā*), gabbhadhāraṇam, paṭhamāya pakatiyā nihīnapakatitā, sūravīratābhāvo, ‘ambakā (B° appakā) jano (B° janā)’ ti ‘hīletabbatā’ ti evam ādi ādīnava-paccavekkhana-pubbakam pi itthibhāvam (B° itthibhāve) ‘alam itthibhāvena, na hi itthibhāve thatvā Cakkavattisirī, na Sakka-Māra-Brahmasiriyo paccanubhavitu, na paccekabodhi, na sammāsambodhi adhigantum sakkā’ ti evam itthibhāvavirajanaṇam, ‘yathāvutta-ādīnavavirahato uttamapakatibhāvato sammataṁ (B° sampadam) idam purisattanā nāma setṭhami uttamam, ettha thatvā sakkā etā sampattiyo sampāpunitun ti evam purisattabhbāve sambhāvanāpubbakam patthanāṭhapanam, ‘tattha ninnaponaṭabbhāracittatā’ ti evam ādike purisabhāvassa paccayabhūte **dhamme. pūretvā** (Sv III 869,18) *vaddhetvā*.

²⁸. In the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, it is stated in the context of the Soreyya story that women “by bestowing alms and performing other works of merit, by putting away desire to continue in existence longer as women, by forming the resolution, ‘May this work of merit of ours avail to procure for us rebirth as men,’ obtain rebirth as men after death. Likewise wives who conduct themselves properly towards their husbands obtain rebirth as men.” (Dhp-a transl. II 25). Although this does not refer to sex-change in the same life, the methods mentioned resemble those listed in Sv-pt (see n. 27).

²⁹. See also Cabezón 2017: 275f.; Gethin (in preparation).

3. Sex-changes in Theravāda legal literature

3.1 The sex-change cases in the *Theravāda-vinaya*

In the *Theravāda-vinaya* the sex-change rules are dealt with in the *Suttavibhaṅga*. This portion of the *Theravāda-vinaya* consists of various layers, the oldest of which is the *Pātimokkha*, the list of rules to be observed by monks and nuns. To these rules are added (1) narratives telling the setting of the rules, the so-called introductory stories, (2) word commentaries, explaining each word of the *Pātimokkha* rules, (3) casuistries mentioning the offences committed when transgressing the rule, and (4) non-offence clauses, giving the cases in which a transgression does not lead to an offence.³⁰ In case of the first nine rules of the *bhikkhus'* *Suttavibhaṅga*³¹ an additional section, called *Vinītavatthu*, comprising various legal cases is found appended to the respective rules. They represent the youngest textual layer of the *Suttavibhaṅga*.³² Other schools have similar case collections, but instead of being appended to the respective *Pātimokkha* rules in the *Suttavibhaṅga*, they are collected in separate texts, called *Vinīta* or *Vinītaka*, which are in turn inserted in other parts of the respective *Vinayas*. In the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, for instance, the *Vinītaka* is transmitted within the *Uttaragrantha*.³³

It is in the *Vinītavatthu* section to the first *Pārājika* rule, which prohibits sexual intercourse for monks and nuns, that we find the passages dealing with sex-change. The *Vinītavatthu* sections are no systematic collections, but seem to be compilations of whatever lists were at hand at the time of the redactional closing of the *Vinaya*.³⁴ The two passages dealing with sex-change actually do not fit in the *Pārājika* rule itself. Moreover, they also do not coincide with the other cases listed in the *Vinītavatthu* of *Pārājika* 1 which deal with sexual intercourse under a variety of circumstances (incest, rape, etc.).³⁵ From the point of view of

³⁰. For an overview of the structure, see von Hinüber 1996: § 22.

³¹. The four *Pārājikas* and five *Saṅghādisesa* rules.

³². Kieffer-Pülz 2011: 4.

³³. For details, see Clarke 2016: 61.

³⁴. This at least is the impression one gets from the *Vinītavatthu* section of the second *Pārājika* (Kieffer-Pülz 2011: 9–12). The others still need investigation.

³⁵. (1) The first case concerns a monk's intercourse with a female monkey (Vin III 34,_{9–13} = 1.10.1). This is a repetition of the second version of Pār 1 (Vin III 22,_{33f}). It therefore most probably stems from a list compiled before this second version of the *Pātimokkha* rule had been formulated. (2) The second case concerns a monk's intercourse without having left the *Saṅgha* in advance (Vin III 34,_{14–20} = 1.10.2). This repeats the third and final version of Pār 1 (Vin III 23,_{33–36}). Thus it probably stems from a list compiled before this third version of the rule came into being. (3) Some cases eliminate the legal uncertainty as to whether or not the change of the outward appearance of a monk documents his having left the *saṅgha*. Even if a monk is dressed like a householder, goes naked like a Jain monk, or wears garments made of grass, bark, etc., he continues to be a monk, and commits a *Pārājika* offence when he has sexual intercourse (Vin III 34,_{21–32} = 1.10.3). (4) A monks' amorous touching a girl leads to her death; this is declared to come under the *Saṅghādisesa* rules (Vin III 34,_{33–37} = 1.10.4). (5) A nun is raped by a brahmin youth; she is declared to be without offence, since she was not willing (Vin III 35,_{1–11} = 1.10.5). (6) Then follow two cases that do not have to do with intercourse, namely change of sex from male to female, and female to male (Vin III 35,_{12–24} = 1.10.6). (7) The next cases tackle incest as a *Pārājika* offence (Vin III 35,_{25–32} = 1.10.7). These regulations were probably necessary because a number of *Pātimokkha* rules exempt a specific behaviour if relatives are involved. (8) Further cases tackle sex with oneself (Vin III 35,_{33–38} = 1.10.8), (9) necrophilia (Vin III 36,_{1–8} = 1.10.9), (10) intercourse with dolls (Vin III 36,_{9–14} = 1.10.10), (11) oral sex (Vin III 36,_{15–20} = 1.10.11), (12) intercourse with only one party being active (Vin III 36,_{21–36} = 1.10.12), (13) again necrophilia (Vin III 36,_{37–37,19}), and (14) intercourse with non-human females and eunuchs (Vin III 37,_{20–23} = 1.10.14). (15) Finally a case shows that a monk's capacity to feel pleasure is irrelevant for the question of his offence (Vin III 37,_{24–29} = 1.10.15). Further cases show monks having intercourse without intending to have it, monks forced to have sexual intercourse by a third party, monks emitting semen during dreamed intercourse, or having oral intercourse with a deer.

content the sex-change paragraphs are, actually, the only ones which do not have to do with sexual intercourse or any behaviour connected to it. They, therefore, seem to be misplaced in the context of *Pārājika* 1 for monks. Although sex-change is mentioned here and there in the various *Vinayas*, interestingly none of the other Buddhist schools has a paragraph on sex-change in their *Vinītakas*.³⁶ Thus it is evident that the sex-change rules in the *Vinītavatthu* of the first *Pārājika* for monks in the *Theravāda-vinaya* were inserted later, and did not belong to a common stock of the various Buddhist schools.

Whether it is because of the misplacement of the cases in the *Vinītavatthu* section of the first *Pārājika* or because I. B. Horner could not imagine such a topic to have been regulated in the Buddhist law code, her translation of these passages veils the content to such an extent that Janet Gyatso (2003: 111, n. 64) could make the statement that “it [i.e. sex-change] does not seem to be present in the early layers of the Pali Vinaya.” Although Gyatso is right that sex-change is not to be found in the early layers, her “early layers” probably comprise the entire *Theravāda-vinaya*, since she does not differentiate various layers of this text and, furthermore, does not mention the relevant passages at all. The two passages³⁷ run as follows:

Now at one time the female sexual characteristic manifested itself in a certain monk. They told this matter to the lord. He said: “Monks, I allow that very preceptor, that very ordination, those very years as a monk, to go (i.e. to continue) with the nuns. Regarding offences of the monks shared with the nuns [I allow that one] to get rid of them in the presence of the nuns. Regarding offences of the monks unshared by the nuns, there is no offence [for the nun].”

Now at one time the male sexual characteristic manifested itself in a certain nun. They told this matter to the lord. He said: “Monks, I allow that very preceptor, that very ordination, those very years as a nun, to go (i.e. to continue) with the monks. Regarding offences of the nuns shared with the monks [I allow that one] to get rid of them in the presence of the monks. Regarding offences of the nuns unshared by the monks, there is no offence [for the monk].”³⁸

These passages show that

- (1) sex-change from male to female and female to male among monastics is described as a spontaneous transformation during sleep without apparent reason;
- (2) a monk not only transforms into a female, but into a nun, and a nun into a monk. This

^{36.} See Clarke 2016: 103 (13b).

^{37.} Vin III 35,₁₂₋₂₄: *tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno itthiliṅgam pātubhūtam hoti. Bhagavato etam atthām ārocesuṁ. “anujānāmi, bhikkhave, tam yeva upajjhām tam eva upasampadām tāni yeva vassāni bhikkhunīhi saṅgamitum* [v.l. *saṅkamitum*]. *yā āpattiyo bhikkhūnam bhikkhunīhi sādhāraṇā tā āpattiyo bhikkhunīnam* santike *vuṭṭhātum*. *yā āpattiyo bhikkhūnam bhikkhunīhi asādhāraṇā tāhi āpattīhi anāpattī*” ti. *tena kho pana samayena aññatarissā bhikkhuniyā purisalingam pātubhūtam hoti. Bhagavato etam atthām ārocesuṁ. “anujānāmi, bhikkhave, tam yeva upajjhām tam eva upasampadām tāni yeva vassāni bhikkhūhi saṅgamitum* [v.l. *saṅkamitum*]. *yā āpattiyo bhikkhunīnam bhikkhūhi sādhāraṇā tā āpattiyo bhikkhūnam* santike *vuṭṭhātum*. *yā āpattiyo bhikkhunīnam bhikkhūhi asādhāraṇā tāhi āpattīhi anāpattī*” ti.

^{38.} Translation Horner (BD I 54): “Now at one time the sign of a woman appeared to a monk. They told this matter to the lord. He said: ‘Monks, I allow a teacher to meet with the nuns during the rains, as for the upasampadā ordination, so as in the presence of nuns to turn the nuns away from those offences which they have in common with monks: but in those offences of monks which are offences not in common with nuns, there is no offence (for the nuns).’

Now at that time the sign of a male appeared to a nun. They told this matter to the lord. He said: ‘Monks, I allow a teacher to meet with the monks during the rains, as for the upasampadā ordination, so as in the presence of monks to turn the monks away from those offences which they have in common with nuns, but in those offences of nuns which are offences not in common with monks, there is no offence (for the monks).’”

Already Bapat (1957: 209, n.1) hinted at the fact that Horner’s translation misses the point. New translations of this paragraph are also provided by Scherer (2006: 66) and Anderson (2017: 2).

implies that the ordinations of monks and nuns, despite their being carried out in different manners, were considered of equal rank;

(3) three things accompany the sex-changed person to the world of the other sex, (a) the preceptor (*upajjhā, upajjhāya*), (b) the ordination (*upasampadā*) and (c) the years (*vassa*).

(a) The preceptor is one of two teachers – the other is the *ācariya/ācarinī* – which a monk or nun, respectively, has from ordination onwards. The preceptor is the more important of the two, since he (or she) is the one who is responsible for the organization and performance of the ordination procedure.³⁹ In stating that the preceptor goes with the monk-turned-nun or nun-turned-monk to the world of the other sex means that a monk-turned-nun keeps her male preceptor, a nun-turned-monk his female preceptor.⁴⁰

(b) Stating that the ordination goes with the monk-turned-nun, etc., makes clear that the ordination a person had received when a male or a female is not null and void because of the sex-change, but persists.

(c) The third element mentioned are the years since ordination. This makes plain that the years a male has spent as a monk are not lost, but count for his new life as a nun, where they determine her rank in the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha*'s hierarchy which directly depends on the age of ordination.

(4) Finally we learn something about the handling of offences. If a monk had committed an offence, but transformed into a nun before he could atone for that offence, then the monk-turned-nun still is an offender. If the rule he broke is one shared by monks and nuns, then she now can atone for it in the presence of the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha*. But if it was a rule exclusive to monks then by transforming into a nun the former monk has been freed from that offence. The same is valid vice versa.

The only other passage in the *Theravāda-vinaya* dealing with sex-change is in the youngest part of the entire *Vinaya*, the *Parivāra* which was attached to this monastic code probably some time after the first century BC or CE.⁴¹ In a list of offences the *Parivāra* mentions offences which one commits or gets rid of by sex-change.⁴² This passage takes up part of the two regulations in the first *Pārājika*, but does not give any additional information.

The next text to mention sex-change from a chronological point of view is the *Milindapañha*. As is well known this text does not completely tally with the interpretation of the Theravāda tradition, and is considered a pastiche and, at least partly, an import from North-West India.⁴³ In an enumeration of things which appear in this world it is stated that a female sexual characteristic manifesting itself in a male is seen, and a male sexual characteristic manifesting itself in a female (Mil 267,13f.). This certainly takes up the two cases from Pār 1 M.⁴⁴

^{39.} Kieffer-Pülz 1992: A 10.3.

^{40.} The text does not touch on the position of the second teacher, i.e. the *ācariya* (pace Bapat 1957: 209). That nuns may in fact have had male *upajjhāyas* is epigraphically documented, see Nakanishi/von Hinüber 2014: 33.

^{41.} Norman 1983: 26, first c. BC; von Hinüber 1996: § 42 based on the probable date of the last *thera* in the line of prominent *Vinaya* teachers dates it to the first c. CE.

^{42.} Vin V 125,₂₉₋₃₄: *aparehi pi catūh' ākārehi āpattīn āpajjati samghamajjhe ganamajjhe puggalassa santike lingapātubhāvena. ... aparehi pi catūh' ākārehi āpattiyā vuṭṭhāti samghamajjhe ganamajjhe puggalassa santike lingapātubhāvena.* “And by four further means does one fall into an offence: in the midst of an Order, in the midst of a group, in the presence of an individual, through the manifestation of a sexual characteristic ... And by four further means does one rise from an offence: in the midst of an Order, in the midst of a group, in the presence of an individual, through the manifestation of a sexual characteristic” (based on Horner, BD VI 198).

^{43.} Von Hinüber 1996: § 173.

^{44.} Discussed by Anderson 2016: 235f., who hints at the fact that the cases in the *Milindapañha* are formulated

3.2 Sex-change in the *Vinayatthakathā* called *Samantapāsādikā*

Most information can be gained from the fourth-/fifth-century *Vinaya* commentary, called *Samantapāsādikā*. In the commentary to the *Parivāra* passage, it names the offences one falls into by the manifestation of a sexual characteristic of the other sex, namely the offences that arise from a joint sleeping place (*sahaseyya*). This refers to Pāc 6 M and Pāc 102 N which prohibit one to share a joint sleeping place with a person of the opposite sex. The second, and much longer portion of the *Parivāra* commentary refers to the offences one is exonerated from on account of sex-change. These are the 46 rules exclusive to monks if one transforms from monk to nun, and the 130 rules exclusive to nuns if one transforms from nun to monk. In this context the male sex is characterized as foremost (*paṭhama*), because it arose first and is the better sex, the female is characterized as low (*pacchima*), because it arose later or is lower.⁴⁵

Much more information is contained in the commentary to the first *Pārājika* concerning the case of an actually occurring sex-change. Text and translation are found in the Appendix to the present article (below, part III). In the following I will summarise this portion of the *Samantapāsādikā*.⁴⁶ The paragraph numbers added refer to the text and translation in the Appendix. The commentary begins with the explanations of the words quoted from the root text (III. Appendix §§ 1–7), confirming the statements made in the *Vinaya*. Scherer (2006: 68) referring to the transfer of “preceptor, ordination and prestige(!)” to the community of the other sex states that according to the *Samantapāsādikā* this only refers to “the case of already established status”, and that “if sex-change occurred before ordination, the person in question should not be ordained etc.” The first part of this statement is self-explanatory, since someone not ordained also does not yet have a preceptor or an ordination which could be transferred to another community. The second part – that a person who changed sex should not be ordained – has no basis in the *Samantapāsādikā*.⁴⁷

The commentary further confirms the statement of the *Vinaya* that if a monastic has transgressed rules exclusive to his sex, he is freed from them as soon as his sex changes. Only offences shared by both sexes have to be addressed in the *saṅgha* of the other sex. Even if a monastic changes sex twice – monk > nun > monk – his offences extinguished by the first

for male and female individuals in general, not for monastics.

⁴⁵. Sp VII 1330,_{12–30}: *liṅgapātubhāvenā* ti (Vin V 125,_{31,34}) *sayitass’ eva bhikkhussa vā bhikkhuniyā vā liṅgaparivatte jāte sahagāraseyyāpatti hoti. idam eva tam paticca vuttam. ubhinnam pi pana asādhāraṇāpatti liṅgapātubhāvena vuṭṭhāti. sahapaṭilābhacatukke yassa bhikkhuno liṅgam parivattati, so saha liṅgapātīlābhena paṭhamam uppānavasena seṭṭhabhāvena ca purimam purisaliṅgam jahati, pacchime itthiliṅge patiṭṭhāti, purisakutpurisākārādivasena pavattā kāyavacīviññattiyo patipassambhanti, bhikkhū ti vā puriso ti vā evam pavattā paññattiyo nirujjhanti, yāni bhikkhunīhi asādhāraṇāni chacattālīsa sikkhāpadāni tehi anāpatti yeva hoti. dutiyacatukke pana yassā bhikkhuniyā liṅgam parivattati, sā pacchāsamuppattiyā vā hīnabhāvena vā pacchiman ti saṅkhyam gatam itthiliṅgam jahati, vuttappakārena puriman ti saṅkhyam gate purisaliṅge patiṭṭhāti. vuttaviparītā viññattiyo patipassambhanti, bhikkhunī ti vā itthī ti vā evam pavattā pannattiyo pi nirujjhanti, yāni bhikkhūhi asādhāraṇāni sataṁ tiṁsañ ca sikkhāpadāni, tehi anāpatti yeva hoti.*

⁴⁶. Sp I 273,_{23–277},₂₈. In the Chinese counterpart to the *Samantapāsādikā*, in Saṅghabhadra’s *Shan-chien-P’i-P’o-sha*, the translation of the relevant portion is found on pp. 211–214 of the English translation by Bapat & Hirakawa 1970. There are several smaller deviations, which probably go back to the translators of the English version; less probably they were caused by Saṅghabhadra.

⁴⁷. Possibly here there is a confusion with regard to monks and nuns who undergo sex-change, and *pandakas* who periodically change their sex like the *pakkhapandaka* (for the latter see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: III [Z 292]).

sex-change do no reappear after his second sex-change⁴⁸ (III. Appendix § 7). This largely confirms what is stated in the *Parivāra* commentary.

Subsequent to the commentary on the root text, the commentator proceeds with an explanation “that is independent from the root-text, but fits in from the point of content”. This introduces the much longer portion of the commentary which begins with the characterization of the male sex as superior, and the female as inferior (III. Appendix § 8). It is followed by naming the offence committed by the two monks who wake up as monk and nun (III. Appendix § 9). Thereafter the commentator describes how to proceed in an actual case of sex-change. The first aim is to change this situation. Therefore, the monk-turned-nun has to immediately inform the other monk about the sex-change, even at night. The other monk shall try to console the monk-turned-nun. This clearly shows that such a sex-change is deemed a shock for the affected person.⁴⁹ The monk then shall ask the monk-turned-nun whether she knows other nuns to whom he might bring her. If that is not the case, then the monk shall bring the monk-turned-nun to nuns known by himself. In order to minimize their committing further offences, the monk shall not accompany the monk-turned-nun alone to a nunnery,⁵⁰ but rather together with four or five other monks. Furthermore, they shall take with them a light (*jotika*) and a mendicant’s staff with rattles (*khakkhara*),⁵¹ and announce their target location in advance. All these elements are intended to illuminate the scenery so that everybody is able to see that nothing wrong is going on there (III. Appendix §§ 10–11).

If the nunnery lies in a settlement different from that in whose vicinity the monks stayed, this group is forced to pass through larger areas outside of settlements. Since the monk-turned-nun is the only nun in the group she normally would commit several offences falling under the third *Saṅghādisesa* rule for nuns, namely to travel to another village without a second nun, to cross a river without a second nun, to stay over night without a second nun, and to fall back behind the group of nuns.⁵² These rules are suspended for this special case (III. Appendix § 12).

The text then describes the meeting in the nunnery: the nuns in the nunnery gone to by them shall be asked whether they know the monk who now is a monk-turned-nun. If they answer in the affirmative, they shall be informed that he underwent sex-change, and now needs their help. If the nuns are friendly, the monk-turned-nun is not allowed to go elsewhere. If, for any reason, she decides to go elsewhere, the suspension of the third *Saṅghādisesa* expires, which means that she now would commit offences by violating the various sub-rules of the third *Saṅghādisesa* for nuns (III. Appendix § 13). But if the nuns in the nunnery are conscientious and unfriendly, or unconscientious and friendly, the suspension of the rule remains valid, and the group with the monk-turned-nun can go elsewhere (III. Appendix §§

⁴⁸ Cabezón 2017: 275, n. 703: “Strangely if the individual then reverts back to being a man, he is exempt from many offenses, like the intentional emission of semen (masturbation).” Here Cabezón takes up the statement in the *Shan-chien P’i-P’o-sha* (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 211), which again is a translation of Sp (III. Appendix § 7). Actually this is not strange, because the intentional emission of semen is an offence exclusive to monks. By transforming into a nun this offence thus ceases to exist, because no such rule exists for them. Once ceased, this offence cannot be revived again by the fact that the nun again changes sex and reverts to a monk.

⁴⁹ Whether this is a general experience or whether it has to do with the downgrading (monk > nun) is unclear. The reverse case (nun > monk) is not described in the commentary.

⁵⁰ This would be a transgression of Pāc 27 M.

⁵¹ For a study of the *kattaradāṇḍa*, *kattarayaṭṭhi*, and the *khakkharaka*, see von Hinüber 1992: 47ff.; 68ff.

⁵² *Saṅghādisesa* 3 for nuns, see Vin IV 227,₁₉–230,₂₅.

14–15). Framed as an opinion of some people, the commentary informs us that, even if the nuns are conscientious and friendly, but unrelated, and relatives of the monk-turned-nun live close by, the monk-turned-nun may also go to them (III. Appendix § 16). Whether this is only the opinion of this minority or was wider disseminated remains unclear. But it illustrates that for this group it was an important criterion whether the nuns to which the monk-turned-nun went were relatives or not. Given that sex-change from male to female is connected with the accumulation of non-virtuous *kamma*, such a monk-turned-nun may also be viewed with suspicion by other nuns. In case of relatives one can expect larger empathy in such a situation.⁵³

The *Samantapāsādikā* further states that all circumstances which referred to the monk-turned-nun when he was a monk are the same now in the nuns' community. Thus, if the monk still lived in dependence (*nissaya*) of a teacher, the monk-turned-nun has to live in dependence of a teacher in the nunnery too (III. Appendix § 17). If the monk had studied the *Mātikā*, that is the *Pātimokkha*, and the *Vinaya*, they need not be learned again now (III. Appendix § 18). Those who were ordained in the monk's presence are well ordained, but need to search for another teacher; likewise those who lived in dependence on him or as his novice (III. Appendix §§ 19–21).

Formal acceptance (*paṭiggahana*) of requisites for daily life such as robe, bowl, medicine, etc., expires, and so does the formal taking possession (*adhitṭhāna*) of objects used by monastics. Thus, things have to be formally accepted anew and also formally taken possession of again (III. Appendix §§ 22–26). Excepted from this is the property of another monk formally accepted by the sex-changed monastic before the sex-change. This formal acceptance does not expire (III. Appendix § 27). The same holds true for shared property which remains undistributed (III. Appendix § 28). If it is distributed the formal acceptance of the sex-changed person expires (III. Appendix § 29). In this context a stanza from the *Parivāra* (III. Appendix § 30) is quoted. Finally, the circumstances which lead to the expiring of the formal acceptance (*paṭiggahana*) are enumerated (III. Appendix § 31).

Regarding personal property of the monk – even real estate – it remains the property of the monk-turned-nun. If such real estate is in a place where the monk-turned-nun cannot access it any longer, as for instance in a monks' monastery, the monk-turned-nun can decide whether to give it to someone else, and to whom (III. Appendix §§ 33–34). Possibly it could also be exchanged for other real estate (?).⁵⁴

Positions and responsibilities in the Buddhist community expire. Since with his sex-change the monk-turned-nun is no longer a member of the monks' community, she also loses former positions held such as that of a distributor of robes. The same is valid concerning reservations of lodgings for the rains retreat. If the sex-change occurs before the second rains retreat begins, then the monk-turned-nun can reserve a place in a nunnery for this second rains retreat. But if the sex-change occurs when the second rains retreat has already begun, then the monk-turned-nun has no chance to spend the regular rains retreat in the manner prescribed in the *Vinaya*. Since the giving of robes in the last month of the rains is linked to having spent the rains in a rains residence, a nun who does not spend the rains properly has

⁵³. Family ties played an important role also for Buddhist monastic communities as has been shown by Clarke 2014.

⁵⁴. Such exchanges of real estate are dealt with in some length in Sp VI 1238,2f. But this section deals with property of the Saṅgha.

no claim to receive a share of the requisites. Since the monk-turned-nun has to stay in some nunnery the community in that nunnery can offer her part of the donations if it wants (III. Appendix §§ 35–37).

Further, it is regulated how to proceed in the case that a monk or nun had committed a *Sanghādisesa* offence. This is discussed at some length, because the penalty in the case of *Sanghādisesa* rules differs for monks and nuns. Monks have to spend a probationary period (*parivāsa*) lasting as long as the offence was concealed, and a *mānatta* period of six days, whereas for nuns there exists only a fortnight-long *mānatta* period. The essence of these many paragraphs is that if the penance is completed before the sex-change, it is fulfilled, and the re-admission can start in the *saṅgha* of the other sex. But if the sex-change takes place while the penance is going on, the penance starts anew in the *sangha* of the other sex following the conditions for this other sex (III. Appendix §§ 38–50).

3.3 Sex-change in the *Vinaya* Subcommentaries

3.3.1 Sex-change of a nun ordained from one side (*ekato-upasampannā*)

Both the *Vinaya* and *Samantapāsādikā* discuss sex-change of fully ordained monastics, that is of monks and nuns who then are nuns and monks, respectively. As illustration of a procedure (*kamma*) which is disturbed (*kuppa*) and irreversible (*thānāraha*) the oldest of the *Vinaya* subcommentaries, the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* (ca. 10th c. CE), which is affiliated with South India and Lanka,⁵⁵ states that in the case of a sex-change of a nun who is ordained from one side only (*ekato-upasampannā*), she does not become a monk, but a novice. This is based on the fact that ordination as a nun in the Theravāda and most other Buddhist traditions is two-tiered. The female is first ordained in the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha*, after which procedure she is called one “who is ordained from one side” (*ekato-upasampannā*). Only with the subsequent ordination in the *bhikkhusaṅgha* is she a full-fledged nun. Since the first legal step – the ordination in the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha* – does not exist for monks, a nun ordained from one side only who transforms into a male, cannot be a monk.⁵⁶ Though this is nothing new from the point of view of content, the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* obviously considered it necessary to make this explicit. One reason could have been that a nun who was ordained as a monk, and thereafter underwent sex-change, strictly speaking also was a nun ordained from one side only, namely from the *bhikkhusaṅgha*. Nevertheless she counts as a nun. This at least is what

⁵⁵. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 70ff., 107–114.

⁵⁶. Vjb 95,_{10–18}: *dutiyam pariyāyena bhikkhunisaṅghato ekatoupasampannāya liṅgaparivatte sati labbhati. tassa hi puggalassa pubbe sikkhamānakāle laddham ñatticatuttha-upasampadā-kammañi kiñcāpi akuppañ c’ eva thānārahañ ca, purisalinge pana pātubhūte anujānāmi, bhikkhave, tam yeva upajhañ tam eva upasampadan ti* (Vin III 35,_{13f., 20f.}) *ettha apariyāpannattā tassa puggalassa kevalañ sāmañerabhāvāpattito kammañi dāni kuppam jātan ti vuccati. liṅgaparivattena cīvarassa adhiṭhānavijahanam viya tassa puggalassa bhikkhunisaṅghena katāya upasampadāya vijahanam hoti ti veditabbañ, aññathā so puggalo upasampanno bhikkhū ti āpajjati.* “The second [procedure (*kamma*)] (i.e. a procedure irreversible, but not legitimate) is obtained in turn if sex-change occurs in a [female] ordained from one side, from the nuns’ community. For, although previously at the time of [being] a trainee a ñatticatuttha-ordination-procedure was obtained [by her] that was legitimate and irreversible, but because – when the male sexual characteristic appears – this male individual (i.e. the nun ordained from one side only, who has turned male) has only reached the status of a novice, since this male individual is not included herein [i.e. in the following statement] “**I allow, monks, just that preceptor, just that ordination**” (Vin III 35,_{14,20f.}), [therefore], the procedure now is called one that has become illegitimate. It is to be understood that as through sex-change [there is] abandonment of the formal taking possession of a robe, [so there is] abandonment of the ordination performed by the nuns’s community for this individual. Otherwise it would follow that this ordained individual is a monk.”

a statement in the South Indian *Vimativinodanītikā* (12th/13th c. CE) renders likely.⁵⁷

3.3.2 Reordination of a nun who changed sex after committing a *Pārājika* offence

All three *Vinaya* subcommentaries, *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, *Sāratthadīpanī* (12th c. CE; Lankan affiliation) and *Vimativinodanītikā*, agree that a monk or a nun who undergoes sex-change after he/she has committed a *Pārājika* offence cannot be reordained in the community of the other sex. In the Theravāda tradition, breaking of the *Pārājika* rules leads to irreversible exclusion from the Buddhist community.⁵⁸ But there exist four *Pārājika* rules exclusive to nuns. Following the *Vinaya* and the *Samantapāsādikā* a nun who transforms into a monk should be freed from that offence, because the respective rule does not exist for monks. So there could, theoretically, be the possibility that with the sex-change the person was freed from such an offence. Here, however, the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* states that such a nun-turned-male only receives the status of a novice.⁵⁹ As a reason it is said that by committing a *Pārājika*

^{57.} Vmv I 154,₂₂₋₂₄: *evarūpā parivattaliṅgā bhikkhuniyo athato ekato upasampannāpi ubhatosaṅghe upasampannāsu yeva saṅgayhanti bhikkhūpasampadāya bhikkhunīpasampadato pi ukkaṭṭhattā*. “Such nuns with changed sexual characteristics (i.e. which had been ordained as males by monks), [who] according to the matter [are] also ones ordained from one side (namely from the *bhikkhusaṅgha*), are included among those [nuns] indeed who had been ordained in both communities, on account of the fact that the monks’ ordination is higher than the nuns’ ordination.”

This statement of the Vmv makes clear that the nuns who are nuns by sex-change, and thus have received only ordination from one side, namely from the *bhikkhusaṅgha*, are considered equal to the nuns who had undergone the two-tiered ordination for nuns, obviously in contrast to the nuns who were only ordained from one side in the nuns’ community.

^{58.} For a different practice in the other Buddhist schools, namely the *śikṣādattaka* status, see Clarke 2000, and 2009. Anālayo 2016 has taken a critical stance vis-à-vis Clarke’s explications. He states “The institution of the *śikṣādattaka* is in this respect comparable to the option of becoming a novice, mentioned in the Pāli commentary, by confessing that one has lost one’s status as a fully ordained monk” (Anālayo 2017: 29). In the Theravāda tradition, a monk who commits a *Pārājika* offence is automatically excluded from the order. The question is whether he is only excluded from the status of a monk, or also from the status of a novice. In the earlier case his years as a novice would still count and would guarantee him a place at the upper end of the hierarchy among the *sāmaneras*, whereas in the latter case he would newly receive the *pabbajā* and then be at the lower end of the novices’ hierarchy. Vin III 23,₂₆₋₂₉ only says that one who had sex without previously leaving the order, may not be ordained again (*na upasampādetabbo*). The commentary states that one who again received the *upasampadā* would be disrespectful with respect to the *sāsana* (which is the reason why he should not receive the *upasampadā* again) whereas one who remains in the stage of a *sāmanera* will be respectful (*sāmanerabhūmiyam pana thito sagāravo ca bhavissati*, Sp I 230,₉). This statement does not illuminate whether the respective person receives the novice ordination anew or simply remains being ordained as a novice after having committed a *Pārājika* offence. It only shows that the stage of a novice is allowed for a *Pārājiko* (Sp-ṭ II 44,₁₇₋₁₉; Vmv I 120,₁₀₋₁₂). Anālayo’s (2017: 29) reference to the possibility of withdrawing from the monk’s status by wishing to become a novice (i.e. deliberate downgrading from monk to novice) – which is completely independent of the *Pārājika* offences – does not fit in here. The *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, in another context (below, n. 59) says that someone who committed a *Pārājika* offence does not obtain the *upasampadā*, but obtains the *pabbajā*. This implies that with his *Pārājika* offence he has lost any ecclesiastical status. Thus in the Theravāda tradition the *Pārājiko* would be newly initiated as a novice and – unlike a *śikṣādattaka* who is hierarchically placed between monks and novices (Clarke 2000: 163) – would be at the lowest end of the hierarchy of the novices. Thus he cannot be equated with the *śikṣādattaka* from this point of view. Further information provided by Clarke shows that the *śikṣādattaka* lives according to the *Pātimokkha* rules, and is to be dealt with according to the procedures prescribed for monks of good standing if he transgresses, for example, a *saṅghāvāšeṣa* offence. The *śikṣādattaka*-stage, therefore, definitely is more than “a more institutionalized version of the basic option of remaining in robes at a level below that of a fully ordained monk” (Anālayo 2017: 30). It rather reminds one of a Theravāda *bhikkhu* who has to live under probation (*parivāsa*) because he has concealed a *saṅghādisesa* offence. For further details concerning the *śikṣādattaka* status, also with respect to his spiritual possibilities, see Greene 2017: 369–408.

^{59.} Vjb 114,₂₅₋₂₉: *sace bhikkhunī asādhāraṇam pārājikāpattiṇ āpajjivtā purisaliṅgam paṭilabhati, bhikkhūsu*

offence exclusive to nuns, the monastic loses her status as a nun, or more precise, as a monastic for ever. Being transformed into a man thereafter, a female transforms into a male – not a nun into a monk – and then cannot be ordained as a monk, but as a novice only. The other two commentaries do not specify the type of *Pārājika* committed by the nun – which actually also is not necessary if one follows the just given argumentation. But the *Sāratthadīpanī* gives an *abhidhamma* reason for the prohibition of reordination in such a case. Its author explains that the female-turned-male has the same [consciousness] stream (*santāna*) as he had, when still a nun. Thus, there actually is only one *santāna*.⁶⁰ The explanation of the *Vimativinodanītīkā* goes in the same direction when its author explains that in one and the same individual a *Pārājika* offence does not disappear.⁶¹ This makes the female-turned-male unfit for ordination as a monk, even if the *Pārājika* he had committed as a nun was exclusive to nuns. It seems that the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition here goes another way (see below, II 5).

3.3.3 Reordination of a nun who changed sex subsequently to leaving the order

A further topic discussed in the *Vajirabuddhiṭīkā* and the *Sāratthadīpanī* is the question whether or not a nun who left the order informally and then transformed into a male can be ordained again. According to the *Vinaya* nuns cannot formally leave the order (Vin II 279,₂₈₋₃₀). Following the *Samantapāśādikā*, a nun who leaves the order informally by dressing in white clothes may not be reordained (Sp VI 1295,₂₅₋₂₈). Thus based on canon and *aṭṭhakathā* commentary a nun can neither formally nor informally leave the order, and if she withdraws informally, she cannot be reordained. This attitude is shared by the entire Theravāda tradition, and leaves nuns with no possibility to reordain after having left the order.⁶²

The subcommentaries discuss what happens if a nun leaves the order informally, and thereafter undergoes sex-change. A minority quoted in the *Vajirabuddhiṭīkā* states that the male person may receive full ordination, if as a nun she has left the Buddhist community.⁶³

upasampadam na labhati, pabbajam labhati. ... vibbhantāya bhikkhuniyā purisalinge pātubhūte bhikkhūsu upasampadam na labhati, pārājikam. “If a nun, having committed an offence entailing defeat that is not shared [with the monks], obtains the male sexual characteristic, s/he does not obtain ordination among the monks, she obtains novice ordination. ... If the male sexual characteristic manifests itself in a nun who has informally left the order, the [female-turned-male] does not obtain ordination, [but] the [state of being] defeated.”

A nun who has informally left the order is equated with one who has committed a *Pārājika* offence (Kieffer-Pülz 2015–16: 21). This is the basis for the final statement of the Vjb.

⁶⁰ Sp-ṭ II 106,₇₋₁₀: “*pārājikam āpannassa liṅgaparivatte sati santānassa ekattā na puna so upasampadam labhati, tathā vibbhantāpi bhikkhunī liṅgaparivatte sati puna upasampadam na labhatī*” ti vadanti. “‘If a sex-change occurs of one who has committed an offence entailing defeat, [then] he does not obtain ordination again, because of the oneness of the [consciousness] stream [of the person as a male and as a female]. Similarly also a nun who has informally left the order does not obtain again ordination after a sex-change occurred.’ [This people] say.” The source of this quotation is unknown.

⁶¹ Vmj I 159,₁₅₋₁₈: *pārājikam āpannānam itthipurisānam liṅge parivatte pi pārājikattassa ekasmim attabhāve avijahanato puna upasampadā na dātabbā ti gahetabbam.* “It is to be accepted, that even if in the case of women and men who have committed [an offence entailing] defeat a sex-change occurs, ordination must not be given again [to them], because the existence of an offence entailing defeat does not cease in one and the same living being.”

⁶² For references, see n. 11.

⁶³ Vjb 95,₂₄₋₂₇: “*bhikkhunī pana gihilingam sādiyantikālena purisalingapātubhāve sati bhikkhūsu upasampadam labhatī ti sādhakam kāraṇam na dissati. ‘sikkham paccakkhāya uppabbajitā ce, labhatī’ ti eke, tan panāyuttam bhikkhuniyā sikkhāpaccakkhanābhāvato ti amhākam khantī*” ti ācariyo. “‘But no effecting

This opinion – shared by the Mūlasarvāstivādin (II 4) – is refuted by an *ācariya*, who most probably was a Lankan *ācaryia* of the tenth century CE,⁶⁴ with the reasoning that there is no possibility for nuns to leave the community formally. In the *Sāratthadīpanī* this cause is also mentioned with the source indicated by *vadanti* (“people say”, see n. 60).

3.3.4 Possibilities of reordination after sex-change depending on the biological age

The *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* discusses in detail the possibilities of the reordination of a nun and a monk under the condition of various sex-changes. Suppose a nun transforms into a monk (first sex-change), who then leaves the community formally – which is an accepted practice for monks. After his withdrawal from the community another sex-change occurs to him (second sex-change), so that he is a woman again. As a woman he wants to be ordained again as a nun. This is allowed, because monks may formally leave the community, and the withdrawal from the community occurred when he was a male.

The discussion further takes into consideration the question of the age, and thus throws some light on the question which has been discussed controversially at some length, namely whether the allowance to ordain a woman of twelve years who is a *gihigatā*,⁶⁵ refers to her biological age or to the years she was already married or no longer a virgin, etc. As is well known this is an exemption from the regular rules which allow ordination for men and for unmarried girls (*kumārī*), at the age of twenty, at the earliest. The *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* now describes the case of a nun of twelve years who undergoes sex-change (first sex-change). She then is a monk of twelve years, despite the fact that men regularly cannot become monks with less than twenty years of age. That the commentator speaks of the biological age becomes, however, evident from the subsequent examples. For, it is described that this twelve-year-old monk formally leaves the community, to come back some time later with the wish to be reordained. He is denied ordination with the argument that he has not yet reached the minimum age for ordination as a monk. The case is further elaborated. The boy again undergoes sex-change (second sex-change), and again is a twelve year old female. Since this female formerly was already a nun, she must have been a *gihigatā*, because only *gihigatās* are allowed to be ordained at age twelve. The text tells us that she may be ordained as a nun.⁶⁶

reason can be seen, that in the time period in which she enjoys the outward mark of a householder a nun obtains ordination among the monks when the male sexual characteristic has manifested itself [in her]. «If she has left the order, having given up the training, she obtains [ordination]», some [people say]. This, however, is incorrect, because for a nun the giving up of the training (i.e. the formal withdrawal from the community) does not exist. [This is] our conviction,’ the teacher says.”

⁶⁴. Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 133ff. (*no takko ti ācariyo*).

⁶⁵. See above, n. 9.

⁶⁶. Vjb 115,₁₋₈ (ad Sp 277,₁₇ ad Vin III 35,₂₅₋₃₂ [Pār 1.10.7 M]: *bhikkhuniyā līngaparivatte sati bhikkhu hoti. so ce sikkham paccakkhāya vibbhāmitvā ithiliṅgam paṭilabheyya, bhikkhunīsu upasampadām paṭilabhati ubhayattha pubbe pārājikabhāvam appattattā. yā pana bhikkhunī paripuṇṇadvādasavassā purisaliṅgam paṭilabheyya, upasampanno bhikkhu eva. puna sikkham paccakkhāya āgato na upasampādetabbo aparipuṇṇavīsati-vassattā. puna līngaparivatte sati bhikkhunīsu upasampadām labhati. evam ce katadvādasasaṅgahassa dārakassa līngaparivatte sati gihigatā itthī hoti, paripuṇṇadvādasavassā upasampādetabbā kira.* “If there is sex-change of a nun, she becomes a monk. If he, having given up the training (that is, having formally left the order), [or] having informally left [the order] obtains the female sexual characteristic, [the male-turned-female] obtains ordination among the nuns, because of the fact that in both (i.e. the *bhikkhu*- and the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha*) he/she has not previously reached the status of being defeated. But if a nun of a full twelve years obtains the male sexual characteristic, [the nun-turned-monk] is ordained, a monk indeed. If, having given up the training (i.e. having left the order), he comes back again, he is not to be ordained, because [he] is not a full twenty years of age. If again a sex-change occurs, [the male-turned-female] receives ordination among the nuns. If in that

From this theoretical discussion it becomes clear that the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* in tenth century Lanka and/or South India understood the *Vinaya* rule regarding the allowance to ordain a twelve-year-old girl as a rule referring to the biological age of the girl.

3.3.5 Handling of the case of a suspended monk after sex-change

The *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* further discusses a matter in connection with the committing of offences, and the procedures to be taken thereafter. If a monk has been suspended (*ukkhitta*) for not seeing an offence exclusive to monks by the *bhikkhusaṅgha*, and thereafter transforms into a nun (first sex-change) no measure has to be taken. This is completely in agreement with what we see in the *Vinaya*, and the *Samantapāsādikā* (III. Appendix § 7). But if the monk-turned-nun then again reverts to his former sex (second sex-change), this monk is again a suspended monk, and has to be restituted (*osāreti*) to again be a regular member of the *bhikkhusaṅgha*. Thus he has to undergo the procedure of restitution (*osāraṇa*) which is obligatory after a suspension. For that purpose he is to be asked whether he sees his former offence. If he responds in the affirmative, he may be restituted. But unlike in the regular procedure the monks are not allowed to ask this monk to confess his offence, because he is freed from it already through the sex-change (Vjb 444,1ff.,24-27; see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III [Z 302]).

3.3.6 Miscellaneous

All three commentaries mention sex-change here and there in the context of various rules. But the oldest of them contains by far the most references. Sometimes they make explicit whether or not the formal taking possession (*adhiṭṭhāna*) of objects expires and has to be renewed,⁶⁷ or whether the formal acceptance ceases.⁶⁸ In the context of Niss 4 M which prescribes a *Nissaggiya* offence for a monk who has an old robe washed or dyed, etc., by a nun not related, the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* states that if the bhikkhu changes his sex, the offence arises by virtue of one ordained from one side (i.e. from the *bhikkhusaṅgha*) as in the case of the Sākīya women who also had been ordained by the *bhikkhusaṅgha* (Vjb 238,17f.). In connection with Niss 21 M ruling that an extra bowl is to be kept ten days at most, the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* states that in case of sex-change a *Nissaggiya* offence arises for a monk who transgresses ten days, but for a nun already when she transgresses one night (Vjb 268,1f.). The latter is based on Niss 1 N which forbids nuns to hoard bowls. But sex-change is also mentioned in still more theoretical contexts. So it is, for instance, discussed whether a monk ordained by the *ehi bhikkhu* or the *tisaranagamana* ordination, when he underwent sex-change, and became a nun may be called a nun ordained by an *ehi bhikkhunī* or *tisaranagamana* ordination. This is refuted by some (*eke*), but the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* states that it should be accepted after having been considered (Vjb 352,10-13).

way a sex-change occurs in a boy who is included among those who have completed twelve years, he becomes a ‘woman that has gone to a householder’ (*gihigatā*), [that is] a married woman (*itthi*), who has fulfilled twelve years of age, she may, as is well known, be ordained.”

⁶⁷. For instance, the expiring of the formal taking possession of a robe (*cīvara*) serves as a comparison for the expiring of the ordination of a woman in the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha* (Vjb 95,16-18);

⁶⁸. For instance, Vjb 577,21f.; Sp-ṭ III 491,23-25.

4. Conclusions

In sum the topic of sex-change is introduced in the Theravāda canon relatively late, when most of the canon was already redactionally closed. It is only mentioned four times, and this in the youngest layers of the *Vinayapiṭaka*, namely the *Vinītavatthu* to *Pārājika* 1 for monks, where it does not fit in very well, and the *Parivāra*. It is not mentioned in the corresponding sections of other schools' *Vinayas*, that is in the *Vinītakas*. This makes it likely that it did not belong to a common stock of the texts of the various Buddhist schools. It probably was the presence of sex-change stories in the cultural setting in which Buddhism originated that led to its introduction into the Buddhist writings, and thereby in the monastic law code, because the legal consequences of sex-change had to be tackled by Buddhist legal specialists, in order to cover all possible cases.

The detailed discussion of sex-change in the *Samantapāsādikā* shows that the commentator tried to cover all possible legal aspects of sex-change in the frame of monastic law. He also gave an explanation of how sex-change worked which he explicitly classifies as independent from the canonical text. Only in this analysis is the male-to-female transformation qualified as inferior to the female-to-male transformation.

The subcommentaries then discuss a handful of cases not covered by the previous texts, as the question whether nuns who left the order and subsequently underwent sex-change could be ordained in the *bhikkhusaṅgha*, or whether nuns who committed a *Pārājika* offence and underwent sex-change thereafter, could be ordained again. Some of the topics discussed are also touched at in the writings of the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, which we are briefly going to look at now.

II. Sex-change in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition

1. Sex-change rules for the transformation from male-to-female and vice versa

As stated above the possibility of sex-change transmitted in the *Vinītavatthu* section of the first *Pārājika* rule in the Pāli *Vinaya* is not found in the *Vinīta* sections of other schools' *Vinayas*, which in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* forms the second section of the *Uttaragrantha*. Nevertheless, sex-change appears in any thinkable situation (Finnegan 2009: 134f.).⁶⁹

“Moreover, the vinaya imagines sex-change happening at any moment. This becomes clear from a long series of questions put to Buddha by Upāli, ... Literally several dozen situations in which sex-change could take place are explored over the course of the first 200 pages of the *Uttaragrantha* section of the MSV [*Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, addition PKP],⁷⁰ and several others are sprinkled elsewhere in the same section of the MSV. Upāli ... asks how to handle a situation were a bhikṣu changes sex and becomes a bhikṣuṇī in the midst of stealing, while touching a woman, and in the midst of engaging in a long list of other possible forbidden acts. It is also imagined that the sex-change could take place during sexual intercourse. And what if bhikṣu changes sex during the rains retreat, when boundaries are set and shifting of residence is prohibited?”

In the Theravāda tradition, as we have seen, the *Vinaya* does not tackle sex-change in connection with any of the rules, except for the two regulations dealt with above. The

^{69.} See also Cabezón 2017: 275, n. 703

^{70.} Which corresponds to the *Upālipariprcchā*, see Clarke 2015: 77.

Samantapāsādikā discusses the effects of sex-change for various aspects of the monastic's life, but does not describe cases. In the subcommentaries, we have instances where the effects of sex-change are discussed in commenting on one or another rule, but here too this is more theoretical.

A regulation parallel to the one in the *Theravāda-vinaya*, discussing a monk's transformation into a female and vice versa is given in the *Kṣudrakavastu*. Finnegan translates the example of female-to-male transformation as follows:

“Venerable Upāli asked the Lord, ‘Venerable, if a bhikṣuṇī changes sex, what should be done with regard to her?’

And the Lord replied, ‘Upāli, place that one at the same age among the bhikṣus. Moreover, that becomes full ordination and bhikṣu-hood.’”⁷¹

As in the Pāli tradition, a monk transforms into a nun and a nun into a monk. No further activities are required after such transformations. As Finnegan (2009: 133) puts it:

“A monastic whose sex changes simply shifts to the appropriate order, male or female, with no loss of seniority and no fuss. For all the gaps between men and women as they are gendered in this text, and for all the nuanced differences in their rules and status and treatment, these rulings assume that literally all that distinguishes a bhikṣuṇī from her male counterpart are her genitals.”

In the Pāli *Vinaya* it was in addition stated with respect to the rules shared by both sexes that the sex-changed monastic can atone for transgressions in the Sangha of the other sex, whereas with respect to rules unique to one sex only he/she becomes freed from offences through sex-change. A similar statement is contained in the *Kathāvastu*⁷² of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.⁷³

2. Sex-change during ordination

Sex-change may also occur at the moment of ordination as a monk or nun. Such a case (male-to-female) is dealt with in the *Nidāna* in the *Uttaragrantha*.

“The Venerable Upāli asked the Buddha, the Blessed One, ‘Reverend, if at the time of ordination [a male candidate] changes sex, is he deemed to have been ordained or deemed to not have been ordained?’

The Blessed One said, ‘Upāli, though indeed ordained, [he] must be sent (or admitted) among the nuns.’”⁷⁴

⁷¹. Derge Da 160a5–7 (Finnegan 2009: 133f. n. 255): *dge slong ma las mtshan gyur na / de la ji lta bur bgyi zhes zhus pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / u pā li de ni lo du lon pa de bzhin du dge slong gi nang du zhog shig / de yang bsnyen par rdzogs shing dhe slong pha'i dngos por 'gyur ro.*

⁷². Clarke 2015: 79. The *Kathāvastu* is a portion of the *Uttaragrantha* (sTog, ‘Dul ba NA 291b6–320b3). For parallel texts, see Clarke (in preparation): 89.

⁷³. Clarke (in preparation): 32 and n. 71 with the following references: sTog, ‘Dul ba NA 312a5–7; T. 1441 (xxiii) 568a4–7; T. 1435 (xxiii) 377a4–8. See also p. 42, n. 159 (with a reference to the discussion on gender transformation as a way of attaining absolution from offences in the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*, and to further literature).

⁷⁴. *Nidāna* in *Uttaragrantha*, ‘Dul ba gzhung dam pa, Kangyur S (‘dul ba) na, 101a3–4: *sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das la | tshe dang ldan pa u pa li zhus pa | btsun pa bsnyen par rdzogs pa'i tshe mtshan 'phos na | de bsnyen par rdzogs pa zhes bgyi'am | bsnyen par ma rdzogs pa zhes bgyi | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pal | u pa li bsnyen par ni rdzogs mod kyi | dge slong ma'i nang du ni thong zhig ||* Text and translation, Clarke 2010: 233f.; see also Kishino 2013: § 1.1.1.

We also find this topic tackled in Guṇaprabha's autocommentary on *Vinayasūtra* 618, where it is stated:

“If the mark of sex (*vyañjanam*) of [a male candidate] searching for ordination (*upasampadā*) changes, is he to be called one that has been ordained, [or] is he to be called one that has not been ordained. One says: ‘He is to be called one that has not been ordained (masculine gender),⁷⁵ for the ordination of a nun [has been carried out] by monks, the being a nun is to be strived after,’ [this is] the text here.”⁷⁶

This statement at first sight looks as if it contradicts the earlier passage from the *Nidāna*, because it is stated that such a person is not ordained (*anupasampanno*). But the point is, that here the masculine gender is used (*upasampanno*), and the one ordained, since she is a nun now, is not called *upasampanno*, but *upasampannā*. If taken that way the text tallies with the statement in the *Nidāna*, and also with the Theravāda tradition.

3. Multiple sex-changes

In the same context as the regulation in the *Kṣudrakavastu* it is stated that sex-change may occur a second time, which implies that the monk-turned-nun and the nun-turned-monk both revert to their original sex.⁷⁷ According to Finnegan, a double sex-change is no problem, but “a third sex-change becomes a problem”.⁷⁸ She does not give a reason or a source for this statement. But the information could be drawn from Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* (ca. 5th c. CE) and his auto-commentary. There it is stated (Sūtra 616–17) that the restraint – or “vow”, as it is understood in the Tibetan tradition (*saṃvara*, Tib. *sdom pa*)⁷⁹ – persists over two sex-changes, but not over a third one.

(616) **Not in case of a third change of the sexual characteristic**, not is [there] the field for restraint (vow), [this is] the attachment. Whose sexual characteristic changes three [times], for him restraint (vow) is not valid, [that is] the meaning.

(617) **Not [is there] a ceasing in the first and second [instance]**. Not is there a ceasing of the restraint (vow) in the first or second change of the sexual characteristic, [this is] the meaning.”⁸⁰

According to this, if one is already ordained before a sex-change occurs, the third sex-change has the effect that one can no longer be a monastic. Gyatso (2003: 111)⁸¹ states that “it is only at three sex-changes that one must forfeit one's entitlement to the monastic status altogether”, giving the impression that the person concerned had to actively undertake something to forfeit its status. Whether this really is the case or whether the person ceases to be considered

⁷⁵. This statement at first sight looks as if such a person is not ordained, but the point is that here the masculine gender is used (*upasampanno*), and the one ordained, since s/he is a nun now, is not called *upasampanno*, but *upasampannā*.

⁷⁶. Bapat & Gokhale 1982: 54,₅₋₈ [sūtra 618]: *upasampadāpekṣino vyamjanam parivartate, upasampanno vaktavyo 'nupasampanno vaktavyah* || *āha: anupasampanno vaktavyah* || *bhikṣubhyo hi bhikṣunyā upasampadā bhikṣuṇībhāvah paryeṣitavyah*” *iti atra granthah*.

⁷⁷. Derge Da 160a7–b6 (Finnegan 2009, 134, n. 256).

⁷⁸. Finnegan 2009: 134.

⁷⁹. Cabezón 2017: 132; see the investigation of the meaning of *sdom pa* by Kishino 2015: 2.

⁸⁰. Bapat & Gokhale 1982: 54,₁₋₄: (616) **na tṛīyasyām parivṛttau vyamjanasya** || *saṃvarasya na kṣetratratvam ity anubandhah* || *yasya trir-vyamjanam parivartate, na tasya samvaro rohatī arthah* || (617) **na prathamadvayoh dhvastir iti** || *na prathamadvitīyayoh vyamjanaparivṛtyoh dhvamsah samvarasyety arthah* |

⁸¹. Mentioned by Doniger 1999: 297; Scherer 2006: 68; Anderson 2016: 242, without further discussion.

a monastic automatically is unclear. As a reason for this prescription Gyatso refers to the Tibetan commentator mTsho-sna-ba Shes-rab bZang-po (ca. 13th c. CE) who stated that “after three sex-changes one lacks any reliable identity as either a male or a female, and so cannot take ordination in either order.”⁸² This statement does not say anything about how the end as a monastic becomes visible. Rather it concentrates on another aspect, namely, that after the third sex-change a renewed ordination is not possible. Thus, a person after the third sex-change would be barred from ordination. That this restriction is passed on to the present day is evident, as shown by Cabezón, from a contemporary *Vinaya* commentary, the *'Dul ba'i sdom tshig*, which contains a list of people to be denied ordination, because they have obstacles to the emergence of vows, among them individuals who changed sexes three or more times.⁸³ Gyatso also gives the impression that the three-time sex-change is an obstacle for ordination, but she does so based on the *Vinayasūtra*.⁸⁴ Whether this accepted limitation was there from the beginning needs investigation. In the list of obstacles for ordination given by Härtel (1956: 80f.) based on Central Asian fragments at least this case is not mentioned. The restriction as to numbers of sex-changes permissible for monastics does not exist in the Theravāda tradition, at least as far as the texts written in Pāli are concerned, although in most cases only two sex-changes are described.

4. Reordination of a nun who changed sex subsequently to leaving the order

Another question dealt with in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is whether or not a nun who gave up the discipline, that is, left the order, and then changed sex, is eligible for ordination as a monk. As could be seen in the context of the Theravāda rules, only one minority was of the opinion that these former nuns could be ordained as monks (see above, I 3.3.3). But this stance was rejected by the entire Theravāda commentarial tradition. This is different in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition. In the *Kathāvastu* it is stated that a nun who has renounced her training, i.e. who disrobed, cannot reordain. A way around this is that she changes sex and reordains in the male Saṅgha.⁸⁵ This is taken over also in later times as can be seen from a statement by Dharmamitra, a pupil of Guṇaprabha,⁸⁶ in his *Vinayasūtratākā*.⁸⁷

5. Reordination of a nun who changed sex after committing a *Pārājika* offence

In the *Kathāvastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* it is ruled that a nun who has committed one of the four *Pārājika* offences exclusive to nuns, thereafter may reordain as a male if she changed sex.⁸⁸ Different from the Theravāda tradition where this is refuted (see above I 3.3.2), this seems to be the general attitude of the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition.⁸⁹

⁸². 'Dul tik nyi ma'i 'od zer legs bshad lung gi rgya mtsho (Beijing: Khrun-go'i Bod-kyis Shes-rig dPe-skrung-khang, 1993; reprint, 1998), p. 214.

⁸³. Cabezón 2017: 380f.

⁸⁴. Gyatso (2003: 111, n. 64) states that “three-time change occurs in a list of what prevents ordination in *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* tradition in *Vinaya-Sūtra*, sūtra 617”. (617 should certainly be 616.)

⁸⁵. sTog, 'Dul ba NA 316b4–317a1; T. 1441 (xxiii) 569a16–19; T. 1435 (xxiii) 377c15–18; all references according to Clarke (in preparation) n. 87.

⁸⁶. Seyfort Ruegg 1981: 102, n. 326.

⁸⁷. Dharmamitra, *Vinayasūtratākā*, D Tengyur, 'u, 87a–b.” (Cabezón 2017: 275, n. 703).

⁸⁸. sTog, 'Dul ba NA 317a1ff., T. 1441 (xxiii) 569a20ff.; all references according to Clarke (in preparation) n. 91, and p. 49.

⁸⁹. As stated by Clarke he did not find a parallel for this in the *Kathāvastu* version of the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

6. Possible causes for sex-change

The *Nidāna* contains a case where Upāli asks the Buddha in how many ways a Buddhist monastic boundary (*sīmā*) is dissolved. The Buddha gives five ways for the dissolution of a *sīmā*. The third is if “the entire community changes [their] sex.” (Clarke 2010: 234, n. 27; Kishino 2013: § 1.4.1). In Yi jing’s translation this runs as “the assembly changes their sex at the same time.”⁹⁰ Though it remains unclear how and why sex-change should lead to the dissolution of a monastic boundary, at least if it were one determined in a legal procedure,⁹¹ what is interesting in our context is that if that method ever was applied, one has to assume that all members of the community are considered to cause the change of their sexes deliberately⁹² and, possibly, simultaneously. Thus, unlike the Theravāda sources which mention sex-change during sleep (*Vinaya, Samantapāsādikā*) or during deep sleep only (*Vajirabuddhiṭīkā*, see above, n. 17), here all monks would be assembled, awake, come to the decision to change their sex, and would finally change their sexes, eventually even simultaneously. In how far here *karma* would be the agent of sex-change needs investigation.

Another case reported from a 16th c. CE *Vinayasūtra* commentary by Mi-bskyod rDo-rje, relates the case of a nun “who is walking alone down a path and suddenly transforms into a male.”⁹³ Thus here the person also is awake.

There is a great discrepancy between such cases and those mentioned in the Theravāda tradition where no such cases of sex-change in a waking state are described to my knowledge.

In the textual passages looked at so far, the cause for sex-change either is not mentioned at all, or it is described as a deliberate decision as in the present case. Further causes coming up in this tradition are the act of truth (*satyakriyā*), namely in the story of Rūpavatī in the *Divyāvadāna* (473f.),⁹⁴ and *karma*, in the case of the Bodhisattva’s male-to-female transformation because of having called monks “women”, dealt with in the present volume by Dhammadinnā Bhikkhunī.⁹⁵

7. Male-to-female transformation calamitous, female-to-male transformation a boon?

With respect to the large number of examples of sex-change given in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* Finnegan (2009: 136) states:

“It bears stressing here – particularly in light of the oft-quoted comments from Pāli commentaries presenting female-to-male transformations as boons and male-to-female transformations as calamitous for the former male – that the MSV [*Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*] itself in these passages does not distinguish in any significant way between female-to-male and male-to-female transformation”.⁹⁶

Actually in the – compared to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* – admittedly few cases of sex-change in the Theravāda tradition, there also is no difference made between the female-to-

⁹⁰. Kishino 2013: 329, n. 29.

⁹¹. This also holds true for three of the other ways, namely the entire community leaves and goes away, returns to secular life or dies (Kishino 2013: § 1.4.1).

⁹². Deliberately in order to abolish the *sīmā*.

⁹³. Gyatso 2003: 110 and n. 63.

⁹⁴. Ohnuma 2000: 121f.

⁹⁵. Cabézon 2017: 349, n. 878; Dhammadinnā Bhikkhunī in the present volume (pp. 63–94).

⁹⁶. For a further quotation in this connection, see Dhammadinnā 2018: n. 57.

male and male-to-female transformations. The description as good or bad come only up in connection with the explanation of the arising of the sex-changes in the *Atthasālinī* and the *Samantapāsādikā*, and this section is explicitly designated as one independent of the canonical text (see aboveI 2). Thus, the fact that in the description of the various cases in the Mūlasarvāstivāda texts this factor does not play any role,⁹⁷ does not say anything about the way in which these two different sex-changes are valued from an *abhidhamma* point of view in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition. It may be that Theravāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda are not that different in this respect.

8. Conclusions

The few examples from the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition dealt with here make plain that in some cases the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition perfectly matches the Theravāda tradition, whereas in others it does not. To the former belongs (1) the fact that sex-change does not invalidate the status of a monastic, but that a monk becomes a nun, and vice versa; and (2) that a monastic is freed from offences exclusive to one sex by transformation into the other sex, whereas for offences shared by both sexes he has to atone in the presence of the Saṅgha of the other sex.

To the matters which are ruled differently in both traditions belong (1) the possibility that nuns who change sex after having left the order can be ordained in the male *Saṅgha* according to the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition (II 4), a possibility accepted by a refuted minority only, but denied by the majority of the Theravāda tradition (I 3.3.3); (2) the possibility that nuns who have committed a *Pārājika* offence exclusive to nuns, and thereafter changed sex may be ordained in the monks' community according to the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition (II 5), a possibility denied by the Theravāda tradition (I 3.3.2); (3) the explicit restriction of permissible sex-changes for a monastic to up to two times in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition (II 3), which has no counterpart in the Theravāda texts, although in the descriptions not more than two sex changes are described explicitly.

In light of these conformities and discrepancies a systematic investigation of sex-change in the Mūlasarvāstivādin texts, and the legal writings of the other schools' *Vinayas*, would be highly desirable and certainly rewarding.

^{97.} Anālayo 2014: 112–114.

III. Appendix: Sp I 273,₂₃–277,₂₈

§	Text	Translation
1	<i>cuddasame vatthumhi itthiliṅgam pātubhūtan ti rattibhāge niddam okkantassa purisa-saṅṭhānam massudāṭhikādi sabbam antara-hitam itthisaṅṭhānam uppannam.</i>	In the fourteenth case the female sexual characteristic manifested itself , means: in the night when he was asleep [his] male form such as beard, whisker[s] disappeared completely, [and] the female form appeared.
2	<i>tam eva upajjhāṇ tam eva upasampadan ti pubbe gahita-upajjhāyam eva pubbe kata-upasampadam eva anujānāmi. puna upajjhāna gahetabbā upasampadā na kātabbā ti attho.</i>	Just that preceptor, just that full ordination , means: I allow exactly that preceptor previously taken, exactly that ordination previously performed. The meaning is: A preceptor needs not be taken again, a full ordination needs not be carried through again.
3	<i>tāni yeva vassānī ti bhikkhu-upasampadato pabhuti yāva vassagaṇanā, tam yeva vassagaṇanā anujānāmi. na ito paṭṭhāya vassagaṇanā kātabbā ti attho.</i>	Just those years , means: beginning from the full ordination as a monk up to the counting of the years, exactly that counting of the years I allow. The meaning is: The counting of the years need not be carried through from this point (i.e. the sex-change) onwards.
4	<i>bhikkhunīhi saṅgamitun ti bhikkhunīhi saddhim saṅgamitum saṅgantum samaṅgī bhavitum anujānāmī ti attho. idam vuttam hoti: appatirūpam dāni ssā bhikkhūnam majhe vasitum, bhikkhunupassayam gantvā bhikkhunīhi saddhim vasatū ti.</i>	To go with the nuns , means: I allow to go (=) to go (alternative form) together (=) to be provided with the nuns. The [following] is said [by this]: It is unsuitable for her (i.e. the monk-turned-nun) to now dwell among the monks, having gone to a nunnery, she shall live together with the nuns.
5	<i>yā āpattiyo bhikkhūnam bhikkhunīhi sādhāraṇā ti yā desanāgāminiyo vā vuṭṭhāna-gāminiyo vā āpattiyo bhikkhūnam bhikkhunīhi saddhim sādhāraṇā.</i>	Which offences of the monks are shared with the nuns , means: which offences of the monks that require confession ⁹⁸ or require removal ⁹⁹ are shared with the nuns.
6	<i>tā āpattiyo bhikkhunīnam santike vuṭṭhātun ti tā sabbāpi bhikkhunīhi kātabbam vinayakammam katvā bhikkhunīnam santike vuṭṭhātum anujānāmīti attho.</i>	To remove those offences in the presence of the nuns , the meaning is: having carried through a legal procedure to be carried through by nuns, I allow to remove all these [offences] in the presence of the nuns.
7	<i>tāhi āpattīhi anāpattī ti yā pana bhikkhūnam bhikkhunīhi asādhāraṇā sukkavissaṭhi-ādikā āpattiyo, tāhi anāpatti. liṅgaparivattanena tā āpattiyo vuṭṭhitā va honti. puna pakatiliṅge uppanne pi tāhi āpattīhi tassa anāpatti yevā ti ayam tāv' ettha pāṭivinicchayo.</i>	There is no offence according to these offences , means: But which offences of the monks are not shared with the nuns, such as emission of semen, according to these [offences] there is no offence. Because of the change of the sexual characteristic these offences are indeed removed. Even if the original sexual characteristic appears again there is indeed no offence for him according to these offences. This firstly is the regulation according to the text (= <i>Vinaya</i>). ¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸. All offences except the first two categories (*Pārājika, Saṅghādisesa*).

⁹⁹. I.e. *Saṅghādisesa* offences.

¹⁰⁰. This and the following sentence clearly differentiate between the explanation of what is found in the

§	Text	Translation
8	<p>ayan̄ pana pālīmutto okkantikavinicchayo: imesu tāva¹⁰¹ dvīsu liṅgesu purisaliṅgam uttamam, itthiliṅgam hīnam tasmā purisaliṅgam balava-akusalena antaradhāyati. itthiliṅgam dubbalakusalena patiṭṭhāti. itthiliṅgam pana antaradhāyantam dubbala-akusalena antaradhāyati. purisaliṅgam balavakusalena patiṭṭhāti. evam ubhayam pi akusalena antaradhāyati, kusalena paṭilabbhati.</p>	<p>But the [following] is the regulation independent from the text (<i>Vinaya</i>) [but] fitting in with [it]:</p> <p>From among these two sexual characteristics, firstly, the male sexual characteristic is superior, the female sexual characteristic is inferior. Therefore, the male sexual characteristic disappears because of strongly non-virtuous [<i>kamma</i>],¹⁰² the female sexual characteristic is established because of weak virtuous [<i>kamma</i>]. But the disappearing female sexual characteristic disappears because of weak non-virtuous [<i>kamma</i>]. The male sexual characteristic is established because of strong virtuous [<i>kamma</i>]. Thus the two disappear because of non-virtuous [<i>kamma</i>, and] appear because of virtuous [<i>kamma</i>].</p>
9	<p>tattha sace dvinnam bhikkhūnam ekato sajjhāyam vā dhammasākaccham vā katvā ekāgāre nipajjityā niddam okkantānam ekassa itthiliṅgam pātubhavati, ubhinnam pi sahaseyyāpatti hoti.</p>	<p>If the female sexual characteristic establishes itself in one of two monks who, having studied or recited the <i>dhamma</i> together, having laid down in one house, are fallen asleep, then it is an offence of a joint sleeping place (Pāc 6 M, Pāc 102 N) for them both.</p>
10	<p>so ce paṭibujjhitvā attano tam vippakāraṇ disvā dukkhī dummano rattibhāge yeva itarassa āroceyya, tena samassāsetabbo: “hotu, mā cintayittha. vattass’ ev’ eso doso. Sammāsambuddhena dvāram dinnam, bhikkhu vā hotu bhikkhūnī vā, anāvato dhammo avārito saggamaggo» ti samassāsetvā ca evam vattabbam: “tumhehi bhikkhunupassayam gantum vattati. atthi vo kāci sandīṭhā bhikkhuniyo» ti. sac’ assā honti “tādisā bhikkhuniyo atthī” ti, no ce honti “natthī” ti vatvā so bhikkhu vattabbo: “mama saṅgahām karotha idāni maṇī paṭhamām bhikkhūnupassayam nethā” ti.</p>	<p>If, having woken up, having seen his own transformation, he is miserable, depressed, he should announce [it] to the other [monk] that very night-time. He should [then] be consoled by the [other monk, through saying]: “Well, don’t think about it, the fault of the round [of transmigration] indeed is this.¹⁰³ The fully Awakened One has given an opening,¹⁰⁴ whether monk or nun the Doctrine is not precluded, the path to heaven is not obstructed.” And having consoled [him, he] should say [the following]: “It is suitable that you go to a nunnery. Are there any nuns which are friends of yours?”¹⁰⁵ If there are [friends] of hers, having said “There are such nuns”, if there are none, having said “[There] are none”, [the monk-turned-nun] should say to the monk: “Help me, lead me now, first of all, to a nunnery.”</p>

Vinaya, and what is not. The meaning of this sentences is blurred in the English translation of the Chinese counterpart of the *Samantapāśādikā* (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 211).

101. As reads *pana*.

102. The *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* says that it disappears because of many offences (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 211 and n. 10).

103. That means, it is not your fault; for a similar statement, see Dhp-a III 36,_{15f}, Dhp-a transl. II 285f.

104. Literally “has given a door, or a way”.

105. In the English translation of the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 212) this is translated as if the monk-turned-nun speaks to the other monk, though it is exactly the other way round. Consequently also the subsequent conversation is wrongly attributed to two persons.

§	Text	Translation
11	<i>tena bhikkhunā tam gahetvā tassā vā sandiṭṭhānam attano vā sandiṭṭhānam bhikkhunīnam santikam gantabbam. gacchantena ca na ekakena gantabbam. catūhi pañcahi bhikkhūhi saddhim jotikāñ ca kattaradandañ ca gahetvā sañvidahanam parimocetvā “mayañ asukam nāma thānam gacchāmā” ti gantabbam</i>	[Then] that monk, together with her, should go to the nuns who are either her friends ¹⁰⁶ or his friends. And while going he should not go alone. Together with four of five monks, and with a torch and a mendicant's staff, he should go, having released the information, “We will go to such and such a place.”
12	<i>sace bahigāme dūre vihāro hoti, antarāmagge gāmantara-nadīpāra-rattivippavāsa-ganohīyanāpattihi anāpatti.</i>	If the <i>vihāra</i> ¹⁰⁷ is far off outside the village, on the way no offence according to the offences of entering another village, [going] to the other side of a river, being separated [from the Saṅgha] over night, being behind the group (all Sgh 3 N) [occurs].
13	<i>bhikkhunupassayam gantvā tā bhikkhuniyo vattabbā: “asukam nāma bhikkhuñ jānāthā” ti? “āma, ayyā” ti. “tassa itthiliñgam pātu-bhūtam, saṅgaham dāni ‘ssa karothā” ti. tā ce “sādhu, ayyā, idāni mayam pi sajjhāyissāma, dhammañ sossāma, gacchatha tumhe” ti vatvā saṅgaham karonti, ārādhikā ca honti saṅgāhikā lajjiniyo, tā kopetvā aññattha na gantabbam. gacchati ce, gāmantara-nadīpāra-rattivippavāsa-ganohīyanāpattihi na muccati.</i>	Having gone to the nunnery, the nuns [there] should be spoken to [as follows], “Do you know such and such a monk?” [If they respond] “Yes, Venerables”, [they should be told] “The female sexual characteristic manifested itself on him, could you now kindly receive him?” If having said, “Alright yes, Venerables; [but] now we all are going to study, going to listen to the Doctrine, you should go”, ¹⁰⁸ these [nuns] receive [her] kindly, are satisfying, friendly, and conscientious; having disturbed them, [the monk-turned-nun] should not go elsewhere. If she goes [elsewhere], she is not freed from the offences of entering another village, [going] to the other side of a river, being separated [from the Saṅgha] over night, being behind the group (all Sgh 3 N). ¹⁰⁹
14	<i>sace pana lajjiniyo honti, na saṅgāhikāyo aññattha gantum labbhati.</i>	If [the nuns] are, however, conscientious, [but] not friendly, it is allowable to go elsewhere.
15	<i>sace pi alajjiniyo honti, saṅgaham pana karonti tāpi pariccajivtā aññattha gantum labbhati.</i>	Even if they are unconscientious, but receive [her] kindly, it is allowable to go elsewhere, having left even them.
16	<i>sace lajjiniyo ca saṅgāhikā ca, nātikā na honti, āsannagāme pana aññā nātikāyo honti patijagganikā, tāsam pi santikam gantum vat̄atī ti vadanti.</i>	“If they are conscientious as well as friendly, [and] they are not relatives, but in a nearby village there are other [nuns who are] relatives, who are taking care [of her], it is suitable to go into the presence also of them,” [people] say. ¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ This possibility is omitted in the English translation of the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 212).

¹⁰⁷ *vihāra* here referring to the nunnery to which they are heading.

¹⁰⁸ Whereas in the Pāli version this reads as if the nuns had been disturbed by the monk and the monk-turned-nun, and are now going to proceed with what they did before, in the English translation of the Chinese version it is stated that they proceed with this activity including the monk-turned-nun (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 212).

¹⁰⁹ The information about the offences that would occur in such a case are not in the Chinese version (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 212). Instead there is something about the monk-turned-nun being told she should follow the wishes of the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha*.

¹¹⁰ It is not entirely clear how far this quotation reaches back. I have marked only the final sentence for now.

§	Text	Translation
17	<i>gantvā sace bhikkhubhāve pi nissaya-patipanno, patirūpāya bhikkhuniyā santike nissayo gahetabbo.</i>	Having gone [to a nunnery], if even when he was a monk he was in dependence, dependence should be taken [by her] in the presence of a suitable nun. ¹¹¹
18	<i>Mātikā vā Vinayo vā uggahito suggahito, puna uggāñhanakāraṇam natthi.</i>	If the <i>Mātikā</i> ¹¹² or the <i>Vinaya</i> had been learnt [by him], they are well learnt; there is no reason for a renewed learning [by the monk-turned-nun]. ¹¹³
19	<i>sace bhikkhubhāve parisāvacaro, tassa santike yeva upasampannā sūpasampannā, aññassa santike nissayo gahetabbo.</i>	If when he was a monk [he was] one who frequented assemblies, [those] ordained indeed in his presence, are well ordained. In the presence of someone else [they] have to take dependence.
20	<i>pubbe tam nissāya vasantehi pi aññassa santike yeva nissayo gahetabbo.</i>	Even those who previously lived in dependence on him, have to take dependence indeed in the presence of someone else.
21	<i>paripuṇṇavassasāmañerenāpi aññassa santike yeva upajjhā gahetabbā.</i>	Even a novice who has completed his years (i.e. is old enough to become a monk) has to take preceptorship indeed in the presence of someone else.
22	<i>yam panassa bhikkhubhāve adhiṭhitam ticīvarañ ca patto ca, tam adhiṭhānam vijahati, puna adhiṭhātabbam.</i>	But what has been formally taken possession of by him when he was a monk, the three robes and the alms bowl, that loses the [status of having been] formally taken possession of, it has to be again formally taken possession of.
23	<i>saṅkaccikā ca udakasātikā ca gahetabbā.</i>	The breast-ribbon and the bathing-cloth are to be accepted. ¹¹⁴
24	<i>yam atirekacīvarañ vā atirekapatto vā vinayakammañ katvā ṭhapito hoti, tam sabbam pi vinayakammañ vijahati, puna kātabbam.</i>	Which additional cloth or additional alms bowl has been stored by having carried out a legal procedure, that entire legal procedure expires, it has to be carried out again. ¹¹⁵
25	<i>paṭiggahita-tela-madhu-phāṇitādīni pi paṭiggahaṇam vijahanti.</i>	Even the formally accepted [medicines] oil, honey, sugar syrup, etc., lose the [status of the] formal acceptance.

This passage is not contained in the English version of the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 212).

¹¹¹. This paragraph seems to be missing in the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 212). Instead something different is stated, the meaning of which is not entirely clear. Possibly the present paragraph has been misunderstood either by the Chinese or the English translators.

¹¹². *Mātikā* is the *Pātimokkha*. As a monk he certainly learnt the *Bhikkhupātimokkha*, but possibly also the *Bhikkhunipātimokkha*, since monks had to be able to advise the nuns. Since here the *Vinaya* is mentioned too, the monk evidently learnt all regulations for monks and for nuns. Therefore, there is no need for her to learn it anew.

¹¹³. This and the following paragraphs (17–20) seem to miss in the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 212).

¹¹⁴. Both items of clothing are originally for nuns only, thus the monk-turned-nun does not have them. In the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* it is stated that the five robes are to be taken formal possession of, breast-ribbon and bathing-cloth are not mentioned separately (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 212 and n. 12).

¹¹⁵. Unlike monks, nuns are not allowed to have an additional bowl (Niss 1 N).

§	Text	Translation
26	<i>sace patiggahañato sattame divase liñgam parivattati, puna patiggahetvā sattāham vañtati.</i>	If the sexual characteristic changes on the seventh day [after] the acceptance [of the medicines], ¹¹⁶ it is suitable [to store them] for seven days, having formally accepted [them] again.
27	<i>yam pana bhikkhukāle aññassa bhikkhuno santakam patiggahitam, tam patiggahañam na vijahati.</i>	But whichever property of another monk has been formally accepted in [his] time as a monk, that does not lose the [status of] formal acceptance.
28	<i>yam ubhinnam sādhārañam avibhajitvā thapitam, tam pakatatto rakkhati.</i>	What, shared by both, is stored without having been distributed, that [the bhikkhu] in good standing protects. ¹¹⁷
29	<i>yam pana vibhattam etass' eva santakam, tam patiggahañam vijahati.</i>	But whichever property of just this one has been distributed, that loses the [status of] formal acceptance.
30	<i>vuttam pi c' etam Parivāre:</i> <i>telam¹¹⁸ madhum phāñitañ cāpi sappiñ sāmam gahetvāna nikhipeyya, avītivatte sattāhe sati paccaye paribhuñjantassa āpatti. pañhā mesā kusalehi cintitā ti (Vin V 217,₁₄₋₁₇).</i>	For the [following] has been said too in the <i>Parivāra</i> Having accepted oil, honey, sugar syrup, as well as ghee oneself, [if] one should deposit [them]; when seven days not having elapsed, if there is a reason, ¹¹⁹ it is an offence for him eating [them]. These questions were thought out by those of skill. ¹²⁰
31	<i>idañ hi liñgaparivattanam sandhāya vuttam. patiggahañam nāma liñgaparivattanena, kālamkiryāya, sikkhāpaccakkhānenā, hīnā-yāvattanena, anupasampannassa dānenā, anapekkhavissajjanena, acchinditvā gāhena (B^e gahañena) ca vijahati.</i>	For this is said with respect to the change of the sexual characteristic. ¹²¹ Formal acceptance indeed expires through changing the sexual characteristic, through death, through formally giving up the training (i.e. withdrawal from the community), through turning to a lower way of life, through giving to an unordained [one], through bestowing because one is indifferent, and through taking having been robbed.

¹¹⁶. Formally accepted medicines are allowed for seven days (Niss 23 M). In this special case it is allowed to again formally accept the medicine, and to again store them for seven days.

¹¹⁷. I.e. the one with whom he shares the object, and who still is a regular monk. Thus the fact that the object is shared with a monk of good standing protects it, as long as it has not yet been distributed. In the English translation of the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* the parallels to the paragraphs 27–29 are undifferentiated (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 213).

¹¹⁸. om. in Sp B^e.

¹¹⁹. Niss 23 M rules that ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, sugar syrup may be formally accepted by a bhikkhu, and stored up to seven days within which they may be eaten.

¹²⁰. These verses in the *Parivāra* belong to the *Sedanamocanagāthā*, riddle-like verses, which at first sight always are in contradiction to some well known rule (see BD VI, xxxif.). This statement in the *Parivāra* thus contradicts Niss 23 M. The *Samantapāsādikā* declares that the *Parivāra* statement refers to sex-change (see § 31). In the light of the explanations as to the validity of the formal acceptance (*patiggahana*) in the case of sex-change this can only mean that the one who eats and commits an offence is a sex-changed person. *Sāratthadīpanī* and *Vimativinodanītikā* (n. 111) also hint at the fact that the formal acceptance expires when sex-change takes place, and that therefore the sex-changed person would have to again formally accept these stored medicines, otherwise eating them is a *Nissaggiya-Pācittiya* offence, even if there is a reason.

¹²¹. Sp-t B^e II 103,₃₀–104,₂; C^e 477,₂₃₋₂₆: *sāmam gahetvāna nikhipeyyā ti patiggahetvā sayam nikhipeyya. paribhuñjantassa āpatti ti liñgaparivatte sati patiggahañavijahato puna appatiggahetvā* (B^e wrongly *patiggahetvā*) *paribhuñjantassa āpatti.* “Having accepted [them] oneself, [if] one should deposit [them],

§	Text	Translation
32	<i>tasmā sace pi harītakakhaṇḍam pi paṭigga-hetvā ṭhapitam atthi, sabbam assa paṭig-gahaṇam vijahati.</i>	Therefore, even if even a piece of yellow my-robalan is deposited, having been formally accepted, each of his formal acceptance[s] expires (or for all his acceptance expires).
33	<i>bhikkhuvihāre pana yan kiñci 'ssā santakam paṭigga-hetvā vā appaṭigga-hetvā vā ṭhapitam, sabbassa sā va issarā, āharāpetvā gahetab-bam.</i>	But whatever property of hers is deposited in a monks' monastery, whether formally accepted or not formally accepted, over all that only she is the chief, having asked [for it], it is to be taken.
34	<i>yan pan' ettha thāvaram tassā santakam senāsanam vā uparopakā vā, te yass' icchati tassa dātabbā.</i>	But whatever immovable thing here is her property, be it a lodging or a young sapling, they are to be given to whomever [she] wishes [to give them]. ¹²²
35	<i>terasasu sammutīsu yā bhikkhukāle laddhā sammuti, sabbā sā paṭippassambhati.</i>	Whichever agreement among the thirteen [types of] agreement ¹²³ has been obtained [by him] in [his] time as a monk, each of them ceases. ¹²⁴
36	<i>purimikāya senāsanaggāho paṭippassam-bhati.</i>	The allocation of lodgings for the earlier rains [retreat] ceases.
37	<i>sace pacchimikāya senāsane gahite liṅgam parivattati, bhikkhunisaṅgo cassā uppannam lābhām dātukāmo hoti, apaloketvā dātabbo.</i>	If the sexual characteristic changes when lodging has been taken for the later rains [retreat], and the nuns' community is willing to give her [a share of] the obtainment that has come up, [then] it is to be given having approved it.
38	<i>"sace bhikkhunīhi sādhāraṇāya paṭicchan-nāya āpattiya parivasantassa liṅgam pari-vattati, pakkhamānattam eva dātabbam.</i>	"If the sexual characteristic of one changes while he is [still] living under probation because of a concealed offence shared with the nuns, [then] indeed the fortnight-long <i>mānatta</i> period is to be given [to the monk-turned-nun]. ¹²⁵

means: having formally accepted [them, if] one should deposit [them] by oneself. **There is an offence in eating [them]**, means: there is an offence for him eating [them], having not again formally accepted [them], because of the expiring of the formal acceptance when a sex-change occurs."

Vmv I 156,₁₁₋₁₂: *sāmaṇī gahetvāna nikkhipeyyā ti sahathena paṭigga-hetvāna nikkhipeyya. paribhuñjantassa āpatti ti liṅgaparivatte jāte puna appaṭigga-hetvā paribhuñjantassa āpatti.* "Having accepted [them] oneself, [if] one should deposit [them], means: having formally accepted [them] with one's own hand, [if] one should deposit [them]. **There is an offence in eating [them]**, means: there is an offence for him eating them, having not again formally accepted [them] when sex-change occurs."

¹²². This differs in the English translation of the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 213), where the *bhikkhusaṅgha* decides to whom to give the former monk's property.

¹²³. The number of thirteen refers to the offices as mentioned in a list in the *Vinaya* itself : (1) *bhātū-desaka* (Vin V 204,20-28), and (2) *senāsana-paññāpaka*, (3) *bhaṇḍā-gārika*, (4) *cīvara-paṭigga-haka*, (5) *cīvara-bhājaka*, (6) *yāgu-bhājaka*, (7) *phala-bhājaka*, (8) *khajja-bhājaka*, (9) *appamattaka-vissajjaka*, (10) *sāti-yagāhāpaka*, (11) *patta-gāhāpaka*, (12) *ārāmika-pesaka*, (13) *sāmaṇera-pesaka* (Vin V 204,29-34). See also Sp III 578,28 ; VI 1163,16.

¹²⁴. This and the following paragraphs (35-37) are missing in the English translation of the *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha* (Bapat & Hirakawa 1970: 213).

¹²⁵. Since for nuns there does not exist a probationary period (*parivāsa*), and since instead of the six days *mānatta* period usual for monks, they have a fortnight-long *mānatta* period.

§	Text	Translation
39	<i>sace mānattam̄ carantassa parivattati, puna pakkhamānattam̄ eva dātabbam̄.</i>	If [the sexual characteristic] of one changes while he is [still] spending the <i>mānatta</i> period, [then] indeed the fortnight-long <i>mānatta</i> [period] is to be given again (i.e. to the monk-turned-nun). ¹²⁶
40	<i>sace cinnamānattassa parivattati, bhikkhunīhi abbhānakammam̄ kātabbam̄.</i>	If [the sexual characteristic] of one changes who has spent the <i>mānatta</i> [period], the procedure of re-admission is to be carried through by the nuns. ¹²⁷
41	<i>sace akusalavipāke parikkhīne pakkhamānattakāle punadeva liṅgam̄ parivattati, chārattam̄ mānattam̄ eva dātabbam̄.</i>	If [the sexual characteristic] changes just again during the time of the fortnight-long <i>mānatta</i> when the non-virtuous consequence [of <i>kamma</i>] is exhausted, indeed a <i>mānatta</i> [period] of six nights is to be given. ¹²⁸
42	<i>sace ciṇne pakkhamānattē parivattati, bhikkhūhi abbhānakammam̄ kātabban̄” ti.¹²⁹</i>	If [the sexual characteristic] changes when the fortnight-long <i>mānatta</i> [period] has been spent, the procedure of re-admission is to be carried through by the monks.” ¹³⁰
43	<i>anantare bhikkhuniyā liṅgaparivattanavat-thumhi idha vuttanayen’ eva sabbo vinicchayo veditabbo. ayam pana viseso:</i>	In the immediately following case of sex-change of a nun (i.e. Vin III 35, ₁₈₋₂₄) the entire regulation is to be understood indeed according to the method stated here. But the [following] is the difference:
44	<i>“sace pi bhikkhunikāle āpannā sañcarittā-patti paṭicchannā hoti, parivāsadānam̄ natthi, chārattam̄ mānattam̄ eva dātabbam̄.</i>	“Even if at the time as a nun an offence of acting as a go-between has been committed [and] concealed [by her, and she then changes sex], there is no giving of a probationary period, only a <i>mānatta</i> [period] of six nights is to be given [to the nun-turned-monk]. ¹³¹

¹²⁶. This means that the days of the *mānatta* period spent as a bhikkhu do not count, and as a nun the monk-turned-nun has to spend the entire fortnight-long *mānatta* period prescribed for nuns.

¹²⁷. In that case the penance has been completed while still a monk, and so the re-admission can start immediately in the nuns' community.

¹²⁸. In this case the monk-turned-nun while spending the fortnight-long *mānatta* period for nuns changes sex again, and thus has to spend the six-day-long *mānatta* period for monks.

¹²⁹. The *ti* at the end of this sentence indicates that this passage has been borrowed from some older source. The begin of this borrowing is uncertain, but must at least lay four sentences earlier, where the subject of all subsequent sentences is mentioned.

¹³⁰. Under the same circumstances, that is when a new sex-change occurred in the monk-turned-nun, the penance has been completed while a nun, and the re-admission then starts in the monks' community.

¹³¹. In that case the offence has been committed and concealed while being a nun. Since for nuns there does not exist a *parivāsa* penance, the nun, if transformed into a monk, also does not have to undergo the *parivāsa*, but only the *mānatta* penance. The latter, however, according to the length prescribed for monks, that is for six, not for fourteen days. The sex-change is not explicitly mentioned in this case, but has to be assumed according to the context.

§	Text	Translation
45	<i>sace pakkhamānattam carantiyā liṅgam parivattati, na tenattho, chārattam mānattam eva dātabbam.</i>	If the sexual characteristic of [that nun] changes while she [still] spends the fortnight-long <i>mānatta</i> [period ¹³²], there is no use of it, indeed a <i>mānatta</i> [period] of six nights is to be given [to the nun-turned-monk].
46	<i>sace ciṇṇamānattāya parivattati, puna mānattam adatvā bhikkhūhi abbhetabbo.</i>	If [the sexual characteristic] changes when the <i>mānatta</i> period has been spent [by her], the nun-turned-monk] is to be re-admitted by the monks without the <i>mānatta</i> [period] having been given again [to him]. ¹³³
47	<i>atha bhikkhūhi mānatte adinne puna liṅgam parivattati, bhikkhunīhi pakkhamānattam eva dātabbam.</i>	Or, if [the sexual characteristic] changes again while the <i>mānatta</i> [penance] has not [yet] been given by the monks, only a fortnight-long <i>mānatta</i> [period] is to be given by the nuns. ¹³⁴
48	<i>atha chārattam mānattam carantassa puna parivattati, pakkhamānattam eva dātabbam.</i>	Or, if [the sexual characteristic] changes again while [the nun-turned-monk still] spends the six-nights <i>mānatta</i> [period], indeed the fortnight-long <i>mānatta</i> [period] is to be given [to the nun-turned-monk-turned-nun].
49	<i>ciṇṇamānattassa pana liṅgaparivatte jāte bhikkhunīhi abbhānakammaṇi kātabbam.</i>	But if the change of the sexual characteristic occurs when [the nun-turned-monk] has spent the <i>mānatta</i> [period], the procedure of re-admission is to be carried through by the nuns.
50	<i>puna parivatte ca liṅge bhikkhunibhāve thitāyapi yā āpattiyo pubbe paṭippassaddhā, tā suppaṭippassaddhā evā” ti.¹³⁵</i>	And if the sexual characteristic changes again (i.e. from female to male), which offences of her had previously ceased even when she was in the status of a nun, they are well ceased.” ¹³⁶

¹³². Here the same conditions as before are valid, she has committed a *Saṅghādisesa* offence, and has concealed it.

¹³³. Since the *mānatta* penance had been completed while she was a nun, it has not to be repeated in her life as a monk.

¹³⁴. That is if the nun transformed into a monk, and again back into a nun, and the *mānatta* penance had not yet been given in the first two stages, it is to be spent in the third stage.

¹³⁵. As in § 42, this text portion ends in *iti*, and it cannot be excluded that it is taken over from some older source.

¹³⁶. It is to be assumed that the section from §§ 44–50 also stems from one source.

Acknowledgment

The beginnings of this article lie in a lecture on the legal implications of sex-change given in 2004 at the 29th Deutsche Orientalistentag in Halle-Wittenberg (Germany). Since then several articles on this topic have appeared. My thanks go to Dhammadinnā Bhikkhunī for pushing me to finally publish this article, and for reading and commenting on it. Furthermore, I thank Rupert Gethin for generously providing me with chapter 3 of his book in preparation, and Shayne Clarke for providing me with his yet unpublished article on the *Kathāvastu*, for reading and commenting on my article as well as for improving and correcting my English. Finally I thank Seishi Karashima for giving me the possibility to publish this article in *ARIRIAB*, and Noriyuki Kudo for his editorial work. It goes without saying that all errors are my own responsibility.

Abbreviations

As	<i>Atthasālinī. Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Dhammasaṅgani</i> , ed. Edward Müller. London revised ed.: Pali Text Society, 1979 [Original 1897].
As (transl.)	Bhikkhu Nyānaponika [transl.], <i>Darlegung der Bedeutung (Atthasālinī)</i> , ediert Sven Bretfeld and Rainer Knopf, Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2005.
BD	I. B. Horner [transl.], <i>The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka)</i> , 6 Vols. London 1938–1966 (Sacred Books of the Buddhists 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 25).
B ^e	Burmese edition (Chatthasaṅgīti edition).
Dhp-a	<i>Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā</i> , 5 vols., ed. H. C. Norman. London: Pali Text Society, 1906–1914.
Dhp-a transl.	<i>Buddhist Legends</i> . Translated from the original Pali text of the Dhammapada Commentary by Eugene Watson Burlingame, 3 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts 1921 (Harvard Oriental Series, Volumes 28–30).
Derge	The Sde-dge Mtshal-par Bka'-gyur: a facsimile edition of the 18th century redaction of Si-tu Chos-kyi-'byuñ-gnas prepared under the direction of H.H. the 16th Rgyal-dbañ Karma-pa. 103 vols. Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang, 1976–1979.
<i>Divyāvadāna</i> .	<i>A collection of early Buddhist legends</i> , ed. E. B. Cowell, Robert A. Neil, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1886.
M	Monks (used together with the abbreviations for the <i>Pātimokkha</i> rules).
Mil	<i>Milindapañha</i> , ed. V. Trenckner. London: Pali Text Society, 1986.
N	Nuns (used together with the abbreviations for the <i>Pātimokkha</i> rules)
Niss	<i>Nissaggiya-Pācittiya</i> rules in the <i>Pātimokkha</i>
Pāc	<i>Pācittiya</i> rules in the <i>Pātimokkha</i>
Pār	<i>Pārājika</i> rules in the <i>Pātimokkha</i>
Sgh	<i>Saṅghādisesa</i> rules in the <i>Pātimokkha</i>
Sp	<i>Samantapāśādikā, Vinayaṭṭhakathā</i> , 7 vols., ed. J. Takakusu, M. Nagai (and K. Mizuno in vols. 5 and 7). London: Pali Text Society, 1924–1947.
Sp-ṭ	Sāriputta [from Polonnaruva], <i>Sāratthadīpanī</i> , 3 vols. Rankun: Chatthasaṅgīti, 1960.
sTog	The Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur. 109 vols. Leh, Ladakh: C. Namgyal Tarusergar, 1975–1980.
Sv	[Buddhaghosa, <i>Sumaṅgalavilāsinī</i>] <i>The Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī, Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya</i> , 3 vols., ed. T. W. Rhys Davids, J. Estlin Carpenter, W. Stede. London: Pali Text Society, 1968–1971.
Sv-pt	[Dhammapāla, <i>Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-purāṇatīkā</i>] <i>Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā Līnatthavannanā</i> , 3 vols., ed. Lily de Silva. London: Pali Text Society, 1970.
T	<i>Taishō shinshū daizōkyō</i> 大正新脩大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924–1935.
Vin	<i>Vinaya Pitaka</i> , 5 Vols., ed. Hermann Oldenberg. London 1879–1883.
Vjb	Vajirabuddhittherena katā <i>Vajirabuddhiṭīkā</i> . Rankun: Chatthasaṅgīti, 1960.
Vmv	Coṇiya Kassapa, <i>Vimativinodanīṭīkā</i> , 2 vols. Rankun: Chatthasaṅgīti, 1960.
Yam	<i>Yamaka</i> .

References

Anālayo, Bhikkhu 2008: “Theories of the Foundation of the Nuns’ Order – A Critical Evaluation,” *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka* 6: 105–142.

——— 2014: “Karma and Female Birth,” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 21: 109–153 [reprint in Anālayo, *Ekottarika-āgama Studies* (Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts Research Series, 4), Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 2016: 381–411].

——— 2017: “The Legal Consequences of *pārājika*,” in Anālayo, *Vinaya Studies*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation: 7–34 [originally published in *Sri Lanka International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 5: 1–22].

Anderson, Carol S. 2016: “Changing Sex in Pāli Buddhist Monastic Literature,” *Queering Paradigms VI: Interventions, ethics and glocalities*, ed. Bee Scherer. Oxford: Peter Lang, 231–251. [https://www.academia.edu/31385777/Anderson_Changing_Sex_Ch_11_QP_6_2016_.pdf; last accessed 8.2.2018]

——— 2017: “Changing Sex or Changing Gender in Pāli Buddhist Literature,” *Scholar & Feminist Online* 14.2 <http://sfonline.barnard.edu/queer-religion/changing-sex-or-changing-gender-in-pali-buddhist-literature/>; last accessed 16.01.2018.

Appleton, Naomi 2010: *Jātaka Stories in Theravāda Buddhism: Narrating the Bodhisatta Path*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Balkwill, Stephanie 2016: “The Sūtra on Transforming the Female Form: Unpacking an Early Medieval Chinese Buddhist Text,” *Journal of Chinese Religions* 44.2: 127–148.

——— (forthcoming): “Why does a Woman need to Become a Man in Order to Become a Buddha? Past Investigations, New Leads,” *Religion Compass*.

Bapat, P. V. 1957: “Change of Sex in Buddhist Literature,” *Felicitation Volume presented to Professor Sripad Krishna Belvalkar*, ed. by Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan. Banaras: Motilal Banarsidas: 209–215.

Bapat, P. V. and V. V. Gokhale 1982: *Vinaya-sūtra and Auto-Commentary on the Same by Guṇaprabha*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, XXII. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Bapat, P. V. and A. Hirakawa 1970: *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha. A Chinese verion by Saṅghabhadra of Saṃtapāśādikā. Commentary on Pali Vinaya*, translated into English for the first time. Bhandarkar Oriental Series, No. 10. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Brown, William Norman 1927: “Change of Sex as a Hindu Story Motif,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 47: 3–24.

Cabezón, José Ignacio 2017: *Sexuality in Classical South Asian Buddhism*. Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications.

Clarke, Shayne 2000: “The Existence of the Supposedly Non-existent Śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī. A New Perspective on *Pārājika* Penance,” *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* 29: 149–176.

——— 2009: “Monks Who HaveSex: *Pārājika* Penance in Indian Buddhist Monasticisms,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 37: 1–43.

——— 2010: “Creating Nuns Out Of Thin Air. Problems and Possible Solutions concerning the Ordination of Nuns according to the Tibetan Monastic Code,” *Dignity & Discipie. Reviving Full Ordination for Buddhist Nuns*, ed. by Thea Mohr and Jampa Tsedroen. Boston: Wisdom Publications: 227–238.

——— 2014: *Family Matters in Indian Buddhist Monasticisms*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

——— 2015: “Vinayas,” *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. I: *Literature and Languages*, ed. Jonathan A. Silk, Oskar von Hinüber, Vincent Eltschinger, Leiden: Brill, 60–87.

——— 2016: “The ‘Dul bar byed pa (*Vinītaka*) of the *Uttaragrantha*,” *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* XX: 49–196.

——— (in preparation). “Towards a Comparative Study of the Sarvāstivāda- and Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinayas: Studies in the Structure of the *Uttaragrantha* (1): Kathāvastu—A Preliminary Survey.” [yet unpublished paper].

Dhammadinna, Bhikkhunī 2015: “Women’s Predictions to Buddhahood in Middle-Period Literature,” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 22: 481–531.

——— 2015–2016: “Women’s Aspirations and Soteriological Agency in Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Narratives,” *Journal of Buddhism, Law & Society*, 1: 33–67.

——— 2018: “Karma here and now in a Mūlasarvāstivāda *avadāna*: How the Bodhisattva changed sex and was born as a female 500 times,” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2017*, 21: 63–94.

Doniger, Wendy 1999: *Splitting the Difference: Gender and Myth in Ancient Greece and India*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Doniger O’Flaherty, Wendy 1980: Women, Androgynes, and Other Mythical Beasts. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Esposito, Anna Aurelia 2013: “Wie man im alten Indien sein Geschlecht verändert: Transformation von Geschlecht in der klassischen indischen Literatur,” in Heike Moser and Stephan Köhn (ed.), *Frauenbilder / Frauenkörper, Inszenierungen des Weiblichen in den Gesellschaften Süd- und Ostasiens* (Kulturwissenschaftliche Japanstudien, 5), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz: 503–524.

Finnegan, Damchö Diana 2009: "For the Sake of Women, too": *Ethics and Gender in the Narratives of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. PhD thesis University of Wisconsin-Madison. [Online: http://nunscommunity.net/for_the_sake.pdf; last accessed, 13.2.2018].

Gethin, Rupert (in preparation): "On Being Embodied: The Material World", *Mapping the Buddha's Mind, A Study of Buddhist Systematic Thought in the Theravāda, Sarvāstivāda and Yogācāra Abhidharma* [provisional title], chap. 3.

Goldman, Robert P. 1993: "Transsexualism, Gender and Anxiety in Traditional India," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 113.3: 374–401.

Gonda, Jan 1989: *The Indra Hymns of the Rgveda*. Leiden: Brill.

Greene, Eric M 2017: "Atonement of Pārājika Transgressions in Fifth-Century Chinese Buddhism," *Rules of Engagement. Medieval Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Regulation*, ed. Susan Andrews, Jinhua Chen, Cuilan Liu. Hamburg Buddhist Studies 9. Bochum/Freiburg: projekt verlag.

Gyatso, Janet 2003: "One Plus One Makes Three, Buddhist Gender, Monasticism, and the Law of the Non-excluded Middle," *History of Religions* 43.2: 89–115.

Härtel, Herbert 1956: *Karmavācanā. Formulare für den Gebrauch im buddhistischen Gemeindeleben aus ostturkistanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, III. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung Nr. 30).

Heirman, Ann 2016–17: "Withdrawal from the Monastic Community and Re-ordination of Former Monastics in the Dharmaguptaka Tradition," *Buddhism, Law & Society* 2: 159–197.

von Hinüber, Oskar 1992: *Sprachentwicklung und Kulturgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur materiellen Kultur des buddhistischen Klosterlebens*, Mainz: Franz Steiner Verlag (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1992. Nr. 6).

——— 1996: *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

——— 2008: "The Foundation of the Bhikkhunīsamgha: A Contribution to the Earliest History of Buddhism," *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2007*, 11: 3–29.

Kieffer-Pülz, Petra 2005: "Ehejahre oder Lebensjahre? Die Altersangabe für eine 'verheiratete' Frau (*gihigatā*) in den Rechtstexten der Theravādin," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 155, 1 (2005), 199–238.

——— 2010: "Presuppositions for a Valid Ordination with Respect to the Restoration of the Bhiksunī Ordination in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Tradition," *Dignity & Discipline. Reviving Full Ordination for Buddhist Nuns*, ed. by Thera Mohr and Jampa Tsedroen. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 217–225.

——— 2011: "The Law of Theft: Regulations in the Theravāda Vinaya and the Law Commentaries," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 31: 1–56.

——— 2013: *Verlorene Ganṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭikā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*, 3 vols. (Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

——— 2015–16: "Re-ordination of Former Buddhist Nuns in the Theravāda Tradition," *Buddhism, Law & Society* 1: 1–32.

Kishino, Ryōji, IV 2013: *A Study of the Nidāna, An Underrated Canonical Text of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

——— 2015: "The Concept of *sdom pa* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: On Possible Misunderstandings of the *Brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvr̥ti*," *The Bulletin of the Association of Buddhist Studies, Bukkyō University 佛教学会紀要* 20: 147–192.

Nakanishi, Maiko and Oskar von Hinüber 2014: "Kanaganahalli Inscriptions," *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2013*, vol. XVII, Supplement.

Norman, K. R. 1983: *Pāli Literature. Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hinayāna Schools of Buddhism*, Wiesbaden (A History of Indian Literature, VII).

Ohnuma, Reiko 2000: "The Story of Rūpāvatī. A Female Past Birth of the Buddha," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23.1: 103–145.

Pandita, Bhikkhu. 2017: "Quitting the Dhamma: The Ways of Forsaking the Order According to the Early Vinaya," *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 24: 117–153.

Paul, Diana 1985: *Women in Buddhism, Images of the Feminine in Mahāyāna Tradition*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.

Perera, L. P. N. 1993: *Sexuality in Ancient India. A Study Based on the Pali Vinayapitaka*. Postgraduate Institute of Pali & Buddhist Studies Publication. Colombo.

Scherer, Burkhard 2006: "Gender transformed and meta-gendered enlightenment: Reading Buddhist narratives

as paradigms of inclusiveness,” *Revista de Estudos da Religião* 3: 65–76. [http://www.pucsp.br/rever/rv3_2006/p_scherer.pdf; last accessed 31.12.2017].

Seyfort Ruegg, David 1981: *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*. A History of Indian Literature 7.1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Schuster, Nancy 1981: “Changing the Female Body: Wise Women and the Bodhisattva Career in Some Mahāratnakūṭasūtras,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 4.1: 24–69.

Young, Serinity 2004: *Courtesans and Tantric Consorts. Sexualities in Buddhist Narrative, Iconography and Ritual*. New York: Routledge.